**Minutes – Executive Policy Committee – May 20, 2015**

**Report – Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development – May 12, 2015**

**Item No. 13 Detached Secondary Suites 3 year follow-up Report**

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Policy Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and submitted the following to Council:

1. That the Planning Discussion Report attached as "Appendix A" be received as information.

2. That the Winnipeg Public Service continue to monitor the Detached Secondary Suite application and approval process including the associated development proposals and report back to Council in 5 (five) years from this report's date.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

**Report – Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development – May 12, 2015**

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,

That the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development be concurred in and forwarded to Council.

Carried

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On May 12, 2015, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council.

STANDING COMMITTEE DECISION:

On May 12, 2015, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development directed the Winnipeg Public Service to consult with various industry groups to determine what can be done to eliminate any barriers and improve the Detached Secondary Suite Program in terms of marketing, logistics, implementation requirements, etc., and report back in 180 days.

# ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

**Title:** **Detached Secondary Suites 3 year follow-up Report**

**Critical Path:** Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development

## AUTHORIZATION

| Author | Department Head | CFO | CAO |
|---|---|---|---|
| B. Smith | M. Pittet (A) | n/a | M. Jack<br>A/COO |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Planning Discussion Report attached as "Appendix A" be received as information.

2. That the Winnipeg Public Service continue to monitor the Detached Secondary Suite application and approval process including the associated development proposals and report back to Council in 5 (five) years from this report's date.

## REASON FOR THE REPORT

On May 30, 2012 the City of Winnipeg Council concurred in the recommendations of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development with respect to a review of secondary suite zoning regulations. These recommendations included that the Public Service report back to Council after 3 (three) years or 100 (one hundred) projects, whichever is first, regarding all detached secondary suite applications / projects including, but not limited to; location, size, height, massing, design quality, servicing, parking provided, public input, conclusions and policy recommendations going forward.

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Winnipeg Public Service will continue to monitor the *'Detached Secondary Suites'* application and approval process with a report back to Council in 5 (five) years from this report's date. The report back will highlight the number of Detached Secondary Suite applications received during that 5 (five) year period and will discuss any reoccurring challenges including recommended changes to the existing policy environment.

## DISCUSSION

- In 2012 Council approved changes to the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/06 allowing the introduction of *'Detached Secondary* Suites' as a Conditional Use as well as streamlining the approval process for *'Attached Secondary Suites'.*
- Condition 4 of the Council decision, (outlined above) required a 3 (three) year or 100 (one hundred) project report back by the Public Service outlining details related to *'Detached Secondary Suite'* applications / projects.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

**Financial Impact Statement** **Date:** March 24, 2015

**Project Name:**

**Detached Secondary Suites 3 year follow-up Report**

**COMMENTS:**

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

*"Original Signed By"*
Mike McGinn, CA
Manager of Finance

## CONSULTATION

**In preparing this report there was consultation with:**

### Internal Consultation

Planning, Property & Development

- Zoning & Permits
- Plan Examination

### External Consultation

NA

## SUBMITTED BY

| | |
|---|---|
| Department | Planning, Property & Development |
| Division | Urban Planning |
| Prepared by: | Noah Yauk, District Planner – LSWK Community |
| Date: | April 1st, 2015 |
| File No. | |

V:\1URBAN & NEIGHBOURHOOD BRANCH\Special Projects\Secondary Suite Study June 2010\3 year follow-up\RIS Report Secondary Suites 3 year followup Final.doc

**List of Schedules and Attachments**

1. Appendix 'A' Planning Discussion

**APPENDIX 'A'**

**Planning Discussion**

**Purpose of the Report**

- In 2012 Council approved changes to the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/06 allowing the introduction of *'Detached Secondary* Suites' as a Conditional Use as well as streamlining the approval process for *'Attached Secondary Suites'.*
- Condition 4 of the Council decision, (outlined above) required a 3 (three) year or 100 (one hundred) project report back by the Public Service outlining details related to *'Detached Secondary Suite'* applications / projects.
- The subject report fulfills the 3 (three) year report back requirement.

**Detached Secondary Suite Applications to Date**

Analysis of Detached Secondary Suites is limited as there has only been a total of 3 (three) applications since the use was added to the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law in 2012. Table 1 (below) summarizes these 3 conditional use applications and associated variances. It is noted that the Urban Planning Division supported all three proposals; two of the applications had no opposition while the third application had 2 persons appearing in opposition. All 3 applications were approved at the Board of Adjustment public hearings and none of the decisions of the Board were appealed.

| Address | 361 Avalon Road | |
|---|---|---|
| File #s | DCU 147389/2014C | DAV 147408/2014C<br>1. a floor area for the detached garage of 1,044 square feet (97.0 square metres);<br>2. a secondary suite floor area of 1,044 square feet (97.0 square metres);<br>3. a property which does not abut an improved public lane; |
| Admin position | support | |
| District | Riel | |
| Hearing Body | Board of Adjustment | |
| Opposition | 0 | |
| Result | approved | |

| Address | 454 Dubuc | |
|---|---|---|
| File #s | DCU 148046/2014C | DAV 148034/2014C<br>1. for the construction of a detached garage to permit a floor area of 735 square feet (68.3 square metres);<br>2. for the establishment of a detached accessory secondary suite use located above the detached garage to permit the following:<br>A. a total lot area of 3,000 square feet (278.7 square metres);<br>B. a floor area of 735 square feet (68.3 square metres);<br>C. side yards of 2 feet (0.61 metres); |
| Admin position | support | |
| District | Riel | |
| Hearing Body | Board of Adjustment | |
| Opposition | 0 | |
| Result | approved | |

| Address | 1126 Clarence | |
|---|---|---|
| File #s | DCU 129505/2013C | DAV 129512/2013C<br>1. said suite on a corner lot;<br>2. a height of 25 feet (7.62 metres). |
| Admin position | support | |
| District | City Centre | |
| Hearing Body | Board of Adjustment | |
| Opposition | 2 | |
| Result | approved | |

**Trends and Observations**

With such a small sample size it is difficult to detect any reoccurring trends or issues with the detached secondary suite projects. If the recommendation of this report is concurred in, the public service will again report back at a future date in anticipation of a larger sample size. In the meantime, a few observations can be shared:

1. Servicing Costs:
   Based on our discussions with the applicants, we do know that the servicing costs, (sewer & water) are very high and in some cases and could be discouraging some projects. This was anticipated when detached secondary suites were introduced into the by-law through consultation with the City of Winnipeg Water and Waste Department.

2. Property Market
   With respect to the costs of establishing a detached suite, it is likely that the housing market conditions and cost of land are not high enough to justify the establishment of suites from an economics perspective in many cases. Detached secondary suites are more common in cities with higher land costs such as Vancouver and Victoria where the rental of a secondary suite helps contributes to the mortgage.

3. Uniqueness of Secondary Suite Projects
   One key observation is that each proposed detached secondary suite is quite different from the other. While all of the three of the secondary suites that were approved required variances, each was supported based on its own unique circumstance. This seems to highlight the importance of the Conditional use process as it allows each to be reviewed on a case by case basis in its own context.

4. Collaboration between applicants and the Public Service
   The approval process for secondary suites (including the zoning by-law's uses specific standards) ensures that there is a lot of communication between the applicant and key City departments. The use specific standards highlight issues early on such as servicing considerations, building code requirements, and the physical design of the suite. This allows the applicant to understand the costs and requirements early on in the process. All three of the detached secondary suites have either completed the building permit process or are in an advanced stage permitting.

The Urban Planning Division will continue to monitor future applications with an eye on project details. A list of items to watch out for may include:

- Proposed servicing
- Floor area of proposed suite
- Number of bedrooms
- Neighbourhood concerns

**Recommendations**

1. That the Winnipeg Public Service continue to monitor the Detached Secondary Suite application and approval process including the associated development proposals and report back to Council in 5 (five) years from this report's date.