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APPENDIX A

Current and Proposed Zoning and Permitted Uses – Maps and Tables

Map 1 – Residential Suites – Current Zoning

Note: This map is for demonstration purposes only and is intended to provide a general overview of zones where suites are currently permitted and zones where suites are being considered as a permitted use. This map should not be used to confirm that a suite is or may be permitted on a lot-by-lot basis. Suites are subject to zoning regulations pertaining to lot area, lot width, street frontage setbacks, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. Secondary suites are also specifically regulated under the BC Building Code and must be constructed under a valid Building Permit. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN). Residents interested in constructing a suite or legalizing an existing suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw, contact the Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561, or visit in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.
Map 2 – Secondary Suites – Proposed Zoning

Note: This map is for demonstration purposes only and is intended to provide a general overview of areas where suites are currently permitted and areas where suites are being considered as a permitted use. This map should not be used to confirm that a suite is or may be permitted on a lot-by-lot basis. Suites are subject to zoning regulations pertaining to lot area, lot width, street frontage setback, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. Secondary suites are also specifically regulated under the BC Building Code and must be constructed under a valid Building Permit. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN). Residents interested in constructing a suite or legalizing an existing suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw, contact the Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561, or visit in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.

Secondary Suites
Proposed Zoning
All Urban Residential Neighbourhoods

- Secondary Suites - Current Permitted Use
  (Zones: RT-1, RT-2, RT-3, RC-2, RM-2A (subject to RT-1 regulations))
- Secondary, Garden or Carriage Suites - Current Permitted Use
  (Zones: RS-15)
- Secondary Suites - Proposed Permitted Use
  (Zones: RS-1, RS-4, RS-5)

Additional Features:
- City of Kamloops Boundary
- Highway
- Major Road
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Map 3 – Garden and Carriage Suites – Proposed Zoning – Option A: Garden Suites in the Urban Core

Note: This map is for demonstration purposes only and is intended to provide a general overview of areas where suites are currently permitted and areas where suites are being considered as a permitted use. This map should not be used to confirm that a suite is or may be permitted on a lot-by-lot basis. Suites are subject to zoning regulations pertaining to lot area, lot width, street frontage setbacks, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. Secondary suites are also specifically regulated under the BC Building Code and must be constructed under a valid Building Permit. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN). Residents interested in constructing a suite or legalizing an existing suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw, contact the Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561, or visit in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.

Garden and Carriage Suites
Proposed Zoning Option A
Garden Suites in the Urban Core

- Garden or Carriage Suites - Current Permitted Use
  (Zones: RS-1S - All Urban Neighbourhoods)
- Garden Suites - Proposed Permitted Use
  (Zones: RS-1, RS-4, RS-5, RT-1, RT-2, RT-3 - Downtown, West End, Sagebrush, and North Kamloops only)

Additional Features:
- City of Kamloops Boundary
- Highway
- Major Road
Map 4 – Garden and Carriage Suites – Proposed Zoning – Option B: Garden Suites in All Urban Residential Neighbourhoods

Note: This map is for demonstration purposes only and is intended to provide a general overview of areas where suites are currently permitted and areas where suites are being considered as a permitted use. This map is not to be used to confirm that a suite is or may be permitted on a lot-by-lot basis. Suites are subject to zoning regulations pertaining to lot area, lot width, street frontage setbacks, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. Secondary suites are also specifically regulated under the BC Building Code and must be constructed under a valid Building Permit. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN). Residents interested in constructing a suite or legalizing an existing suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw, contact the Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561, or visit in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.

Garden and Carriage Suites
Proposed Zoning Option B
Garden Suites in All Urban Residential Neighbourhoods

- **Garden or Carriage Suites - Current Permitted Use** (Zones: RS-1S)
- **Garden Suites - Proposed Permitted Use** (Zones: RS-1, RS-4, RS-5, RT-1, RT-2, RT-3)

**Additional Features:**
- City of Kamloops Boundary
- Highway
- Major Road

Filename: Map 4 - Garden Suites - Proposed Zoning - All Residential Suites Policy Update
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Table 1 – Secondary Suites – Current and Proposed Zoning and Permitted Uses

The table below shows key current and proposed zoning regulations for secondary suites. Listed zones have other permitted uses (for example, RS-1S allows daycare facility, home-based business, and other uses) and corresponding regulations that are not listed here. Secondary suites are subject to other zoning regulations pertaining to lot width, setbacks, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. Secondary suites are also permitted in certain areas within two comprehensive development zones – CD-1 (Orchards Walk) and CD-5 (West Highlands) that feature site-specific land use regulations.

Residents interested in constructing a secondary suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw or contact the City’s Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561 or in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone Title</th>
<th>Zone Purpose</th>
<th>Current Permitted Use</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Use</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area</th>
<th>Minimum Street Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-family residential and accessory uses on urban lots</td>
<td>Secondary suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m²</td>
<td>Proposed: 15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-1S</td>
<td>Single Family Residential - Suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential dwellings and dwellings containing secondary suites on urban lots</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>464 m²</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Single Family Residential – 4</td>
<td>Single-family residential use on compact urban lots</td>
<td>Secondary suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m²</td>
<td>Proposed: 17 m on interior and corner lots; 15 m on cul-de-sac lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-5</td>
<td>Single Family Residential – 5</td>
<td>Single-family residential and accessory use on large urban lots</td>
<td>Secondary suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 650 m²</td>
<td>Proposed: 17 m on interior and corner lots; 15 m on cul-de-sac lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-1</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 1</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on urban lots</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>464 m²</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-2</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 2</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on large urban lots or suburban lots</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>650 m²</td>
<td>17 m on interior and corner lots; 15 m on cul-de-sac lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-3</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 3</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on compact urban lots</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite</td>
<td>464 m²</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-2</td>
<td>Comprehensive Residential – 2</td>
<td>Fee simple triplexes and split title side-by-side duplexes with one secondary suite per unit on large lots, corner lots, or lots with lane access</td>
<td>Multi-family residential consisting of two-family residential with maximum one secondary suite per unit</td>
<td>Multi-family residential consisting of two-family residential with maximum one secondary suite per unit</td>
<td>610 m² combined or 305 m² each unit</td>
<td>24 m; 18 m on interior or corner lots with lane access for parking, or corner lots with parking access via two frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-2A</td>
<td>Downtown Multiple Family – Medium Density</td>
<td>Medium- to high-density multi-family residential</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite (subject to RT-1 regulations)</td>
<td>Single-family residential with secondary suite (subject to RT-1 regulations)</td>
<td>464 m²</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 – Garden and Carriage Suites – Current and Proposed Zoning and Permitted Uses

The following table shows key current and proposed zoning regulations for garden and carriage suites. Listed zones have other permitted uses (for example, RS-1S allows daycare facility, home-based business, and other uses) and corresponding regulations that are not listed here. Garden and carriage suites are subject to other zoning regulations pertaining to lot width, setbacks, front yard landscaping, and off-street parking. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN).

Residents interested in constructing a garden or carriage suite should consult the Zoning Bylaw or contact the City’s Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561 or in person at 105 Seymour Street during regular office hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone Title</th>
<th>Zone Purpose</th>
<th>Current Permitted Use</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Use</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area</th>
<th>Minimum Street Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Single-family residential and accessory uses on urban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m² (with secondary access); 650 m² (without secondary access)</td>
<td>Proposed: 15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-1S</td>
<td>Single Family Residential - Suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential dwellings and dwellings containing secondary suites on urban lots</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden or carriage suite</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden or carriage suite</td>
<td>464 m² (with secondary access); 650 m² (without secondary access)</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Single Family Residential – 4</td>
<td>Single-family residential use on compact urban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m² (with secondary access); 650 m² (without secondary access)</td>
<td>Proposed: 15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-5</td>
<td>Single Family Residential – 5</td>
<td>Single-family residential and accessory use on large urban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 650 m²</td>
<td>Proposed: 17 m on interior and corner lots; 15 m on cul-de-sac lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-1</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 1</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on urban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m² (with secondary access); 650 m² (without secondary access)</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-2</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 2</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on large urban lots or suburban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 650 m²</td>
<td>17 m on interior and corner lots; 15 m on cul-de-sac lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-3</td>
<td>Two Family Residential – 3</td>
<td>Single-family and two-family residential and accessory uses on compact urban lots</td>
<td>Garden or carriage suite not permitted</td>
<td>Single-family residential with garden suite</td>
<td>Proposed: 464 m² (with secondary access); 650 m² (without secondary access)</td>
<td>15 m on interior and cul-de-sac lots; 16.5 m on corner lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Residential Suites Open House Results

The following is a verbatim transcript of the results from the Residential Suites Open House, which took place on February 5 from 7:00 to 9:00pm at the Sandman Centre’s Valley First Lounge. Comments are included as written with no edits or revisions made and may contain some of the author’s original spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors.

Display Boards

Should secondary suites be allowed as a permitted use on lots with a single-family dwelling in all urban neighbourhoods?

5% No, secondary suites should only be allowed in the following areas (3 of 61)
3% No, secondary suites should not be allowed in any additional areas (2 of 61)
92% Yes, secondary suites should be allowed as a permitted use on lots with single-family dwellings in all urban neighbourhoods (56 of 61)

Other Comments

Other Comments

If garden suites are permitted on lots with single-family dwellings in more urban neighbourhoods, which additional areas should they be allowed in?

3% Other, please specify (1 of 32)
9% No additional areas (3 of 32)
88% All urban neighbourhoods (28 of 32)
0% Urban Core only - Downtown, West End, Sagebrush, and North Kamloops (0 of 32)

Other Comments

Other Comments

• Appropriate parking must be available, not on narrow streets, not on short cul-de-sacs and bulbs
• Not unless there are good policies in place to deal with illegal suites

• Stick with current process
Based on your level of agreement or disagreement, please rank each of the following statements about suites with the sticky dots provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suites provide an affordable housing option for renters</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites add to the total stock of rental housing in the city</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites provide a mortgage helper and source of income for homeowners</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites allow families to stay together by providing accommodation for children attending university or for aging family members</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites create parking issues in neighbourhoods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive infill through the development of suites is good for residential neighbourhoods</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If suites are permitted in more areas of the city, what are your concerns and what do you hope to see addressed?

- Need at least 4 parking spots/lot (extended family, teenage drivers, drivers in suite, owners) – 3 parking spots NOT enough
- Affordability is the most important. Keep it competitive by only allowing increased rent via property upgrades
- Affordable housing for students + sessional faculty within reasonable distance to TRU – transit
- Garden suites – YES, Carriage – NO
- If she has a suite, how can she find out what is required to confirm without raising a flag that the suite exists?
- An idea whose time has come. Do this!!
- PWD (Persons with Disabilities) - access, pets, parking, low-income
- Taxes increase? Utilities increase?
- Not on cul-de-sacs or narrow streets
- How to get suites already built approved?
- Panhandle lots – infill?
- Flexible parking requirements
- Parking
- Tax incentive to have a suite
- More housing = aggregate economy = better/vibrant Kamloops
- Not opposed to a limited # of sec. suites per block
- It’s YES! A pressing option for low income renters to have options other than apartments with dictatorial landlords
- An efficient, logical solution proven to work in other jurisdictions. Full support!
- Affordable rent for students + others + help with mortgages is important to me
- Safe construction + enough parking
- Might as well legalize them. People will put them in anyway.
- Don’t let lower value buildings, such as low income housing, decrease neighbouring property values.
- Residential suites that comply with building code are safer
- I’m for it. I live in an area with 2nd suites allowed – good land use, no neg. impacts, keeps Kamloops affordable
- Front yards looking like parking lots
- Ensure there are good policies to make current illegal suites conform to code (SAFETY)
- Increase bus service to new suite areas please
- Would like to see an option for lots that don’t meet certain req. to be reviewed individually
- Parking
Panel Discussion – Audience Questions and Comments

**Questions**

- What are the incentives to legalize existing or create new suites?
- How many garden and carriage suites are there and what is the average rent?
- Will the City be able to regulate the number of suites being approved?
- Is there potential for suites/density to overload utilities?
- Will the City have higher service fees with a higher renter to homeowner ratio? (i.e. renters don't pay property taxes)
- Could you explain other cities’ experience with suites?
- How will this impact municipal taxes?
- Why not apply the same parking restrictions to homes with boarders and lodgers?
- Is monitoring of illegal suites going to increase?
- Does driveway width allow for 3 unstacked parking stalls?
- Has Kamloops explored how other cities have dealt with suites?
- How many secondary suites are in Kamloops?
- Would suites be allowed on panhandle lots?
- Any tax incentives for suites?
- Why is Dallas not shown under the proposed area on the maps?
- What is the City’s approach for houses that were built to not have suites, or areas that were built to not have suites?
- Can the City enforce a developer’s private building scheme?
- Would there be increased bus service to areas that permit suites?
- Would there be a separate classification for suites built for family members?
- Why would I out myself to the city to find out if I can legalize my suite?
- Does the City inspect my property to tell me what I need or do I need to get a contractor?

**Comments**

- easier/cheaper to do illegally
- suites have many benefits but parking is an issue
- need a driveway, shouldn't have to park on the street
- residential suites are awesome!
- hard to find a place to rent that is accessible
- no incentive to legalize if it causes your taxes to increase
- would like to see more flexibility in suite regulations – requires too much of yard for parking
- need to have incentives
- zoning should be opened up to suites
- neighbour with legal suite has only 2 parking stalls – not against it but confused by inconsistency
- fire truck access on panhandle lots not an issue from past experience
- more noise from people hanging out in backyards with garden suites than carriage suites
- cost of building a carriage suite is approximately $200,000 + increased property taxes
- need suites to address multi-generational housing needs (aging in place, older family members)
- should prioritize a tax incentive for suite owners
- should make building suites as easy a process as possible
- suites increase housing options for people (e.g. seniors)
- City should have a list of suite requirements as a resource
APPENDIX C

Residential Suites Survey Results

The following is a verbatim transcript of the results from the Residential Suites Survey, which was available online from January 24 to February 24. Personal information included in the comments have been removed to protect the privacy of survey respondents. Prejudicial comments have also been removed. Major spelling mistakes have been corrected, however all other comments are included as submitted and may contain some of the survey respondent’s original spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors.

Q1: Which neighbourhood do you live in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhartvale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocklehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufferin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heffley Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Ridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Sahali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kamloops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Sahali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleyview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westsyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No home address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Responses

- Paul Lake but own property in North Kamloops
- I live in McLure but do business in Kamloops
- Sun Rivers
- Sun Rivers
- Pritchard
- Shuswap Rd
- Tobiano but also own homes in Dufferin and Sahali
- Landmark place, Tru/Sahali
- Lac Le Jeune
Q2: Which statement best describes you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I own a home with a suite</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a home but do not have a suite</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rent a secondary, garden, or carriage suite</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Responses
- I RENT IN AN UP/DOWN DUPLEX
- rent in multi-family dwelling- intend to buy duplex or single with suite in 1-2 yrs
- I live in a home with no suite, but am not the homeowner.
- I own a home with a secondary kitchen & laundry for, which permits were pulled when 2 owners ago the major addition was added to my home.
- rent my apartment suite - public parking terrible
- I own my unit in an apartment complex.
- Interested in future purchase accommodating multiple generations of a family
- I owned a home with a suite
- Fantastic idea!
- I rent in an apartment building
- I live in a strata
- Rent a whole home
- live with parents
- Condo apartment
- I’m homeless.
- I am looking to buy a home with a suite
- Looking to purchase a property and want to know if I can add a suite
- apartment
- I currently rent in an apartment building, but have lived in secondary suites in the past.
- I own my own house and have a rental property also
- I rent a home
- I own a home with an in-law suite - shared kitchen and laundry
- I rent an entire house with no suite.
- Rent in a 6-plex
- Rent townhouse
- Rent apartment
- I live with my daughter
- I own and live in a condo apartment
- is bottom of house. my own address, hot water, gas, and heat
- I live in an in-law suite
- I own a home with an approved home office in a secondary building on a RS-1 residential lot
- Carriage suite on lot; my son lives there.
- Rent an apartment
- Freedom of all home owners to utilize their private property as they see fit, within more relaxed governance.
- Rent duplex
- Large separate room (suite like) : shared facilities with home owners.
- I am renting in a basement two bedroom suite
- manage an apartment building
- Renting a unit in an apartment building
- I rent several rooms within a single family dwelling
- i own rental properties currently without suites
- Apartment
- I rent a duplex
- I Rent a townhouse
- I rent an apartment in an apartment building that has 12 units in it
- Apartment
- renter
- Moving to Kamloops
- I own a 55+ Apartment in a residential neighbourhood
- Own 2 rental apartments
- I have more than 1 property
Other Responses (Continued)
- I rent a Home with a suite
- Rent home with a suite
- I am looking to buy a home with a suite
- Rent an upstairs with a secondary suite below.
- In-law suite
- I live in a mobile home, owned. And I would like to move into the city, but it’s totally unaffordable
- General interest
- I own a Townhouse. no ability to build a secondary suite
- I rent an apartment.
- Live at home with parents.
- Living Area For Family Member/Elderly parents
- Own a townhouse

- It is not cost effective to acquire a building permit and jump through the hoops to comply with today’s code
- I own an apartment
- I rent half of a duplex, live space is on the main floor with a basement below. I have a nice fenced back yard and am able to garden in the front and back yards.
- I live common-law with my partner who owns a house. We have a financial arrangement, but we both have a hand in renovations/maintenance.
- renting an apartment through Kelson Group
- Mobile home
- rent a home
- Rent condo
- I rent it’s too much I would love to rent in someone home where I could have a yard too

- I rent a studio apartment
- Live with my parents who own the home
- Rent a house
- I own multiple rental properties in Kamloops - both conforming and nonconforming suites
- BC housing
- I rent a duplex
- Mini basement room and living room with kitchenette
- I rent an apartment but previously rented a secondary suite in Aberdeen
- 55+Seniors
- I own a home that used to have a suite
- I rent one side of a duplex
- Wanting to move out of parents home, rental suites difficult to find

Q2a: If you own a home with a suite, do you rent it?

27.8%  
No (54 of 194)

72.2%  
Yes (140 of 194)

Q2a - Part 2: If you own a home with a suite, was a Building Permit issued for the suite in your home?

25.3%  
Yes (49 of 194)

74.7%  
No (145 of 194)
Q2a - Part 2a: If you have a suite in your home that was built without a Building Permit, what are the barriers that prevented you from building your suite legally? Check all that apply.

The suite was already in my house when I moved in
BC Building Code requirements are too rigorous and/or costly
 Didn’t want to go through the rezoning and public hearing process
 City fees are too prohibitive
 Other

Other Responses
- Worried/uncertain of the process and if I would be approved, but desperately needed the income.
- Parking requirements.
- Fear
- Was advised that Barnhartvale would not approve suite
- in-law suite to accommodate senior parents - shower no tub, single sink, kitchenette only with no stove/oven
- Got a city permit to rent it out as an Air b and b. I would rather have it as a long term rental.
- I am not zoned for a suite.
- Need a variance for an in-law suite. When buying a new house for my family and in-laws, we would have to apply for a variance before purchasing, which is impossible since we don't own the place. Doing it after purchase risks not getting the variance!
- I don't have enough frontage
- Be more like Kelowna and let people build carriage houses and suites without all the headaches of rezoning..... Make the process of rezoning faster. More efficient somehow. I've waited over 2 years to try to rezone/subdivide
- Wasn't told by builder that needed additional permits
Q2a - Part 2b: If you have a suite in your home that was built without a Building Permit, what would encourage you to apply for a Building Permit to legalize your existing suite? Check all that apply.

**Other Responses**

- I bought the house 3 years ago. Many of the city's records indicate (such as utilities) that I have an upstairs and downstairs. So I possibly have a pre-existing non-conforming situation based on those records.
- The fact it was built suited in 1995, was told it was grandfathered in that is the reason we bought the house and pay double city utilities was to not have to get a building permit.
- So the costs that it would and cure to make 2 PC building codes.
- Transparency in costs and reduced costs.
- Pre-existing non-conforming for homes that have suites.
- For a legal suite building permits and zoning are the least of the problem. The legal building code requirements and city parking requirements are the biggest challenges.
- Allow a grandfather clause for ‘as is’ suite. Cost of an upgrade for compliance is still too expensive.
- It would be too costly to bring it up to code.
- Relaxed building code requirements but with reasonable safety measures.
- No increase in taxes due to zoning change. I'd rather have a variance.
- Complaints from neighbours; direct threat of neighbour complaints.
- Rules that state the city will work with me to bring the suite into compliance over a period of time, rather than just shutting it down.
- Other subsidies.
- Full by-law & BCBC compliance too onerous for retrofit. Exemptions for high cost updates that don't enhance life safety in existing suites: Separate hydro metering, water metering, heating systems, adding parking etc. Focus on life safety issues ONLY.
- I would have to do construction in order to pass inspection as the suite is greater than 40% of the upstairs.
- Tax breaks to offset the potential considerable costs of bringing a home I purchased with an in-law suite up to legal code to be used as a secondary suite.
- Subsidies/reduction in building code requirements.
- Suite was built to code.
- No problem with any permits.... my opinion rethink the guidelines (similar to Kelowna) They are go ahead for building and growth.
- If the suite is safe don't want to go through lots of changes.
Q2b: If you do not have a suite in your home, what would encourage you to obtain a Building Permit to build a legal suite? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning that permits my home to have a suite so I don’t have to go through a rezoning and public hearing process</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived Building Permit fees</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not interested in having a suite in my home</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Responses

- financial incentives for renovations / permits because I’d be helping alleviate pressure on the rental market at a time when less people can afford to be homeowners
- If the city would make the area more conducive to a larger population by making alleyways more accessible and by implementing sidewalks.
- NOTHING. ABSOLUTELY NOTHING would make me want to destroy my neighbourhood and my quality of life.
- My home is part of a strata and does not have capacity, but in my next home I will look for suite capabilities and the zoning/permitting processes would most likely be barriers at that time
- modular on block foundation
- Increase in eligible property types (i.e. half duplex)
- Monstrous homes with equally large garages with rooms above and numerous vehicles are ignored but we can’t have a small carriage house!!! Spoke with City Planning Dept-No, no!! We won’t support your request at City Hall variance meetings!!
- Get rid of double fees for garbage etc.
- I live in apartment
- An ease of the process instead of feeling like every step is not acceptable with the City Building Dept. and therefore a more positive experience. Kamloops has a reputation of being hard-nosed at the building dept. level
- At this point, I’m interested in something like this because I have a disabled adult child and would like to create something that allows him more independence, without having to move to an area that allows it.
- I have other rentals that I would consider adding a second suite
- I do not want a suite and I am strongly against my neighbors having a suite in their home. I lived in a community which went through this process and legalized suites. My old neighborhood lost control as a large number of suites became legal.
- I might be interested in a suite once the kids move out! And if the zoning allowed.
- I live in a townhouse.
- Simplicity and fairness to all neighbours’ view and property privacy.
- No additional fees or home taxes because of the suite. E.g. West Kelowna requires purchase of an annual business licence
- If you continue to charge high permit fees and strict expensive building restrictions people are going to continue with nonconforming suites.
- Rezoning on the merits of my case and a reasonable building permit process
- Info on pricing for plumbing and power changes to a property
- Strata complex not allowed
- Kamloops needs concrete towers in the core. Not shi–y basement suites or cheap wood construction 5 floor apartments.
- I would hope that no building permit is issued in areas with insufficient parking.
- Fast and efficient permitting process
- The ability to easily and inexpensively obtain a bylaw variance to allow the construction of a garden suite on my lot. My lot in North Kamloops is ideally suited with off-street parking. However the maximum lot coverage bylaw will not permit this.
- Make the process quicker. Maybe more communication or updates on where the application is at. More communication I think more than anything.
- Zoning that allows me to rent a room or space in my home without a self-contained suite
Q3: Secondary suites are currently allowed as a permitted use (i.e. they do not require a rezoning process or public hearing, though they do require permits and approvals from the City) in certain zones in urban areas of the city. The City is considering allowing secondary suites as a permitted use on lots with single-family dwellings in all neighbourhoods of the city except suburban and rural areas where current water system capacity is limited. If suites are permitted in more areas of the city, what are your top 3 concerns?

Comments

Parking
Traffic
Bylaw Enforcement

Increase in vehicles in areas where parking is already restricted or limited on the streets, increased noise or disruption from unruly tenants (that is not adequately managed by landlords), strain on city resources (such as garbage pickups, sewage, etc) which could potentially cause an increase in property taxes or a decrease in service levels due to strain on city employees.

Street Parking
Unfair taxation rates for homeowners without suites
Unfair Utility rates for homeowners without suites
Why do I pay the same amount for utilities, property taxes, garbage collection, school taxes as my neighbor who has an illegal rental suite in his basement that houses a whole family the same size as mine.... surely his home puts out more solid waste and sewage waste than my home.

1. Street parking. Tenants usually have at least 2 vehicles. Added to the homeowners vehicles, the streets get very crowded with vehicles parked everywhere;
2. Garbage. More garbage containers will be put out on the street;
3. Tenants generally do not care about neighbourhoods as it is not their permanent residence, and they are not paying taxes. Hence, they tend to treat homeowners with disrespect and also do not care about noise (parties), beat-up vehicles parked around, and lots of people visiting them (which uses up street parking).

On street residential parking is at its limit already in some areas of the downtown core.
Being able to tell what is a legal and an illegal suite. There are lots of cheap illegal(?) suites already placing pressures on noise, parking, safety...

1. Parking
2. Issues with renters (sometimes tenants can be more problematic neighbours than owners)

- absentee landlords who rent out the top and bottom of a house and may not know if their tenants are disruptive to the neighbourhood

-fairness in ability to have suites for suburban and rural that do not have water/sewer capacity constraints
-cost to meet Building Code for existing suites
-loss of greenspace, trees in on urban lots

I do not have any concerns with this, and feel it is a great idea

Parking
Parking
pets

-Legality It concerns me that homeowners may do illegal renovations to save money.
-Safety hazards. Like legality, sketchy electrical work, plumbing, etc. should be monitored.
-More people in neighborhood may increase parking congestion (many landlords don't allow renters to park in driveways) on streets, being dangerous to young families
**Comments (Continued)**

Parking. I would suggest the City allow more of the street adjacent property to be paved to accommodate more parking. We are in a cul-de-sac and parking is already limited. Noise. There would have to be enough Bylaw staff to be able to handle additional complaints.

Our street is zoned single-family dwelling and we have had many problems with illegal suites and absentee landlords over our 29 years of living on our street. From drug trafficking, noise issues and overall safety concerns. A public hearing was scheduled many years ago for the development of a 3 tower multi-family building behind Library Square which we were in favor of and was approved. Our street specifically remains as a single-family dwelling even though there are numerous illegal suites. I do believe what makes up a great neighbourhood is a variety of housing from single-family to multi-family to apartment buildings, and other suites. I believe in densification and feel that every neighborhood should this variety but respecting the legal zoning.

Too many vehicles parked on street. Affects visibility and safety, snow clearing and access for emergency vehicles.

Traffic, congestion and noise.

No concerns

Parking / snow & garbage removal for City could become challenging if too many people parked on the streets?

I have no concerns. This is already happening illegally so creating a process to have legitimate suites will allow us to address issues as they arise.

Only issue I see is parking if the address has sufficient parking to accommodate the suite.

Will they be safe for the tenants? How do you ensure there aren’t so many on a given street that they change the character of the neighborhood?

Additional traffic, adequate parking on the property, updated utility billing to reflect the additional demand on the water and sewer infrastructure.

Parking, noise, & removal of problem tenants.

No concerns

I think it’s a great idea! Only concern is parking.

- Cost of additional city utilities and increased assessments.
- Current lack of sidewalks on the North Shore (more people walking all over the street, which is not safe)
- Alleyways that are blocked or unmaintained by the city. See the alleyway behind Cedar street, it is not accessible from Cherry street.

1) Noise pollution with overcrowded suites
2) Shortcuts by landlords and unsafe illegal suites
3) Water usage

Parking

None. They are necessary

Increased number of vehicles parked on the streetscape
Irresponsible landlords that do not hold their tenants accountable
Tenants that do not respect the character of the neighbourhood and do things that a homeowner would not do (e.g. speeding their neighbourhood)

That the city won’t honor this plan and will refuse to approve permits

Parking
Put a limit of no more than one suite per single family home.
Comments (Continued)

Street parking, noise, increased traffic.

No concerns, I think allowing secondary suites is the best way for a modern city to grow. It also makes housing affordable for first-time homeowners.

Increased traffic in area
Increased noise
More street parking makes clearing snow in winter harder

That home owners making extra income pay their share of water/sewer/school taxes, etc. I'm tired or supporting everyone's extra income. That they have to claim the revenue made as income. That they have sufficient parking for all residents in the home

1. Number of vehicles. Sufficient parking should be on the property, not including street parking. I happen to live across from a top/bottom duplex where they have 5 vehicles plus a boat and no driveway! Because we do not have sidewalks, this is a big safety concern for pedestrians trying to weave between parked cars.
2. General upkeep. Single family homes in my neighbourhood generally have a higher pride of ownership and upkeep, whereas those with rentals are not maintained.
3. Strain on utilities: water / sewer / garbage. Bonus: number of pets allowed per household

Parking where there is not adequate off street parking. Infrastructure improvements such as schooling, doctor availability in our city is already an issue, with suites this would exacerbated. Security, ability/requirements for owners to run adequate background checks/references fir tenants.

I am firmly opposed to this and will be moving out of Kamloops as a result of these types of decisions.

-Parking
-How to ensure existing non-permitted (building permit) suites are safe.
-Impact on neighbours

Parking, especially in winter
People paying their proper city utilities for the suite
Over occupancy of dwellings (8 people in a house meant for 4)

I am a huge fan of increasing the number of available secondary suites in Kamloops! I don’t have major concerns, but if I had to guess what other people would list as concerns...
- extra people parking on street might be an issue, particularly in the winter
- extra pressure on existing city infrastructure

Having them up to some sort of standard. Ensuring certain areas don't become too dense, is on street parking is limited


-Parking

-Parking, increased people = increased traffic concerns & safety concerns, regulation/inspection of suite builds

Parking
Attached Services (i.e. Park availability etc. for increased population)
Quality of suite/type of client

1) Too many cars on house lots and on street parking in neighbourhoods that don't support on street parking.
2) suites poorly designed/built
3) higher transient population - so much turnover makes it hard to establish community

-Parking, Traffic, Theft and vandalism.
CONCERNS:
1) TRAFFIC on narrow streets with already too much parking on them
2) Parking - I LIVE NEXT DOOR to a place that rents out suites - my driveway is frequently blocked
3) NOISE - don’t you want the downtown core to be more dense? How does allowing residential neighborhoods to do this help that cause?
4) Property Value reduction - NOBODY wants to live next to the crap I’m currently dealing with - and your grand vision is to expand that joy to other home owners.

Parking, additional noise, traffic

No concerns! This should have been put through years ago.

1) Properties are identified as having a legal suite & taxed accordingly.
2) Illegal suites are identified & invoiced to incentivize compliance.
3) Allow for reasonable public input from those indirectly & directly affected.

Nose from renters (my neighbour has a suite and because our houses are new and so close together, when the tenant goes in and out of the suite entrance right between our houses, it wakes us up and sounds like they are in our bedroom), parking, don’t want to own a home beside one with renters

1. An overwhelming amount of current suites are un-permitted. The city should allocate more of its time fixing this issue before trying to provide more residents with the ability to add suites....

-Parking/transit (need to have the ability to house an increase in vehicles or improve transit or other solutions to allow more people use take the bus so they don’t have to drive)

-liveability in other neighbourhoods (more grocery stores, services, etc in or closer to those neighbourhoods and alternative travel options to access them so people don’t have to travel across town to get needs met, and don’t have to drive to those services either)

None. We need to densify and infill our urban areas for the sake of the environment. Enough urban sprawl. Allow secondary suites in all areas.

None.

No concerns. This should be done.

On street Parking

Occupant safety

Fewer back yards and green space, developers filling land with multi unit dwellings & having no backyards, congestion/parking

Off street parking - consider more 2 hour parking with parking pass and only allow a certain number of permits per home. I lived at 7th and St Paul for years. I loved that too many tenants = not able to park on the street. Really would encourage you to enforce that.

Parking, proper waste removal, and number of residents on a lot

Parking

Infrastructure costs.

Noise, pets, drug use and smell of it.

Parking is the only concern. Otherwise, great!

1) Parking
2) $$ for extra garbage, sewer, water, etc
3) liability insurance

How will tenants contribute to infrastructure and upgrades in our community - schools, road maintenance, utilities, garbage collection, property tax. Tenants have not contributed in the past and I would like to know if this will change going forward.

Parking, Snow removal and area traffic flow
Comments (Continued)

Neighborhood density - including traffic and tenant parking
Noise
Occupancy - i.e. for example 1 bdr with eight people

Reduced rent charge. Traffic increase
Noise increase
Crime increase

Parking
Building code
Number of occupants

Parking, Noisy Neighbours, More dogs in my neighbourhood

I have no concerns about secondary suites other than parking. As far as Garden or Carriage suites, I object to these because in Westsyde it seems anything goes. People have added garages and workshops onto their properties which after years have still not been finished. Development has been hodgepodge and uncoordinated. Living in Westsyde we put up with no sidewalks, above ground wiring, poor snow removal, and poor water pressure, all because we have larger yards and more greenspace. More garden and carriage suites will remove its one redeeming quality and only add to the disorder. I don't think the neighbourhood should be further downgraded because people assume mortgages beyond their means.

No concerns
1. Parking
2. Safety (legal bedrooms, no mold)

1) Parking. There is not enough on street parking for the suites in our area.
2) Carriage and Garden suites take up important green space for children to play, gardens to be grown.
3) Civic address not properly displayed out of building street side, i.e: carriage house suites and basement suites.

Excessive parking on streets causing the street to become too narrow for two-way traffic.
Safety of suites residents, i.e.: fire safety.

uncontrolled volume of traffic
degradation of the neighborhood
crime

No concerns.
1. Units used for AirBnB.
2. Building Inspectors sufficient to get timely approvals.
3. City not being sufficiently flexible to respond to individual circumstances.

Landlords overcharging, parking, privacy

No concerns

Parking
Parking
Parking

street parking

parking
control on how many secondary suites are actually in the home property owner responsibility of having tenants...

Parking on city streets close to intersections makes it hard to see oncoming vehicles. More people makes more vehicles.

1. Noise created by the neighbours, more people in a house can mean more noise (currently live beside a house with a suite and they both are outside smoking all the time and talking/coughing)
2. People parking in front of my house and/or blocking my driveway.
3. Rental properties don’t always maintain their yard etc.
Comments (Continued)

Parking, traffic, making sure they are being charged enough in taxes/fees that the extra population will contribute to city services

lack of sufficient parking for tenants and their guests

I have no concerns.

There you go there’s the BRICK WALL we face!!! Less rich people can’t afford the mansions that are renting out but honest working people ask permission and are told no way, never!!

On-street parking - not just the parking, but the visibility for pulling out of driveways, for children walking, etc. Many residential streets aren’t wide enough for on-street parking on both sides.

yes

There has to be enough OFF STREET PARKING! Parking infractions must be enforced! There needs to be an occupancy limit on suites.

On street parking. Our road is already very narrow and when vehicles park on the street, it becomes a goat trail. It is especially bad after a snowfall and the plows have nowhere to push the snow.

1. That higher income areas will resist the change and that this will cause further class division between higher income and lower income areas.
2. This change will increase problems with unsafe problem activity in the areas of the city that are already most impacted.
3. Investors will make multi-suite homes as income properties and will have little to no care or concern for the impact trouble tenants have on a neighbourhood — especially those with passionate members already struggling to better their neighbourhood.

Parking

No meddling by local government.
No increased fees.
Let us govern our own private property.

What would the requirements be for off-street parking?

Parking....can’t stand someone else’s car parked in front of my house. That makes it difficult for my family and friends to park.

(1) Noise. I have PTSD from being harassed by city bylaws staff and RCMP, and every little unexpected noise aggravates my symptoms.
(2) Security. I don’t like the idea of the landlord making unauthorized or unannounced visits. Most landlords do not understand the legal rights of tenants or their own legal obligations as landlords.
(3) Parking. Adding more residential space without also adding parking space, means I might have to park my vehicle far from my home, or in an unsafe location.

1. Cost to build suite to code.
2. If existing suite exists easy approval.
3. Ensure adequate parking on the lot.

Parking
Cannabis smoke
Grow ops

Street parking, crime and drugs

-parking
- safety

Parking in the major concern

Parking

Parking, Noise and Strangers in the Hood

None - there are many secondary suites I have seen in other cities where I have not seen a negative impact on
Comments (ContinUED)

- Not enough Parking
- Added Noise
- more unsightly properties
- criminal and drug activity
- Disrespectful neighbours.

1. Parking

I don’t think there are notable concerns. Parking issues will undoubtedly arise, perhaps taxation can be used to improve transit/alternate transportation modes to incentivize lower rates of car ownership.

Parking in downtown residential areas is already problematic in some areas. The city will need to consider how to manage this issue, particularly in areas where people do not have driveways or lane access.

1. Suites that are unregulated and therefore unsafe for tenants
2. Added noise and nuisance with denser populations
3. Overcrowded schools where there is already overcrowding

No concerns. To grow sustainably we need more suites.

No concerns.

1. Parking
2. Over stretched utilities, infrastructure.
3. Taxes - homeowners with suites should pay more property taxes to offset the services they & their tenants would be using.

increase in dogs/cats per property lot as too many people are not responsible pet owners

increase in limited downtown parking spots due to street parking as only option for renter’s vehicles

Availability of on-street parking is my only concern. Both of my neighbours have suites (illegal) and one has no parking on their lot (even for themselves), so that results in four vehicles on the street, and the other neighbour does not allow their tenant to park on their lot, so again, they must park on the street. It makes for parking woes for visitors. Particularly because we are on the first street that is not restricted to two-hour parking, so we get hospital employees parking on the street as well.

I suppose on-street parking would become an issue if there were too many of them concentrated in a single area, but the reality is that there is seldom-used on-street parking available in my neighbourhood to the tune of 2-3 cars per lot.

Problem tenant
Overcrowding
Parking

Overcrowded street parking

- noise & lack of control by property owner
- challenge in reporting issues and fallback on the person complaining
- parking

Parking, noise, pets

lack of consistency in neighbourhood
parking
congestion

1) Units going in areas only accessible by car,
2) units in new homes in areas with less walkability and transit, compared to old areas that are expensive to retrofit
3) suites used as airbnbs
I can only think of 2. (1) If we add density in more suburban parts of town it will mean more people needing to drive more. (2) If we invest in upgrading single-family homes to single family with one or two suites we won’t achieve the same density that we could by building small multifamily. But I wouldn’t want to sacrifice the good for the better. This is still better than expanding the city by creating new neighborhoods. Ideally I’d like to see small multifamily near the city center creating walkable neighbourhoods in order to reduce traffic, reduce emissions, make housing more affordable and save people money on transportation. But one way or another, the solution to so many of our serious problems is to increase density.

Parking
Traffic
Noise

Congestion and parking are problems because most modern subdivisions do not have laneway access, have very narrow lots, typically include only parking on one side of the street etc. Lots of duplexes will end up being 4plexes.

1. Lack of parking and no access to rideshare or Uber
2. Not enough bylaws officers to deal with problem people who may be renting in the area
3. No free drug program for low income people with drug problems. If they were given the drugs and recreational users paid for theirs then our homes and vehicles and businesses would not be robbed or broken into. We all pay for this in insurance, policing, court system etc. If they were provided this they would stop causing as many problems for the community. It would also eliminate gangs, black market and overdose deaths from impure or tainted drugs.
4. Have funds for landlords for cleaning up the mess that renters leave behind and for payment when the renters owe money and court orders payment but the renters don’t have any money.

1. THIS IS ESSENTIAL:
Revise city bylaw on yard and sidewalk maintenance AND DRIVEWAYS WITH EASEMENTS to create a bylaw EXPLICITLY MANDATING occupant(s) *renters to perform yard maintenance such as weeding, shovel snow on sidewalk, driveway INCLUDING driveway INCLUDING DRIVEWAYS WITH EASEMENTS WITH NEIGHBOUR’S PROPERTY enforceable with SIGNIFICANT monetary fines if neighbours, including neighbours with driveway easement show evidence that occupant(s)/tenant(s) are NOT shoveling INCLUDING not shoveling their portion of the driveway (bylaw mandate needs all these components !)

2. THINK ABOUT IT!!! Landlord has right to suite suspended if tenant causes X many issues/complaints from neighbour (or self-reported by landlord)...i.e. tenant is forced out of the place by *city’s notice* to landlord that the suite must be vacated, with consequences to THE TENANT (not the landlord) if the tenant DOES NOT VACATE. Then let the landlord re-rent the suite after a penalty period of three or six months. THERE NEEDS TO BE A WAY FOR RESIDENTIAL LANDLORDS TO RECOUP LOSSES and restore their property and yard if damaged by tenants ...as it is, neither an RTB order for monetary repayment from tenant NOR its court enforcement order guarantees that the tenants pay!!! The tenant can continue to NOT pay, and be inconvenienced by periodic arrest for hearing, and then re-released as they can’t be detained after the hearing, and continue to not pay, and be rearrested and released, ad nauseum. STILL NO MONETARY COMPENSATION TO LANDLORD. and the property depreciated, with no repair due to loss of revenue to landlord. Ridiculous situation created by stupid laws. Meanwhile the residential landlord is treated as if they are responsible for provision of social housing. Need change in regulations and laws AND a fund for landlords to draw from when get their property ruined by tenants.

3. MAKE SURE THE LANDLORDS DO NOT HAVE TO ACCEPT PETS OR TOBACCO or WEED SMOKERS Or VAPING --or even young children if it is not appropriate noise-wise! i.e. if there are people living in the other portion of the building whose sleep and right to quiet enjoyment would be interfered with by constant little kids screaming or running around or baby crying all the time
Comments (Continued)

Parking - too many people parking on streets
Noise - too densely populated, so no quiet spaces
Garbage - too many dumpsters on the road on garbage day

- Street parking.
- Lack of snow removal because of increased street parking.
- Lack of buses and the need for increased buses in the majority of urban areas that will now be dealing with increased populations.

Parking

Insufficient parking, owners who do not live at the same address, unkempt properties.
Only houses that have enough room to park all vehicles in front of their OWN property should be considered for a secondary suite.

1. Every suite must have an off road parking spot for the tenant as to ease the discord with neighbours who have to park on the street.
2. # of tenants in a suite ie. 1 bedroom maximum of 2 people / 2 bedroom maximum 4 people. Large groups of students etc in a 2 bedroom disrupts the neighbourhood because of parking etc

1) Parking- Ensuring that adding a suite does not impact the neighbours regular parking availability

2) Ease of Approval- I am looking to buy a property and need to know ahead of time IF it will be eligible for a suite before purchase. Currently I do not know a way of getting this info

1) Other people always parking in front of my home so my guests don’t have parking.
2) Noise
3) leaving garbage on my yard

Lack of sidewalks and bike infrastructure to promote emission-free transit. Transit, parking, and infrastructure for increased population.

Suites must have adequate parking so as not to negatively impact neighborhoods.

Adequate Parking on the property that is hosting the suite. On street is not an amenity supporting the suite
Sufficient room for snow removal and access for emergency services es vehicle

Parking, having proper permitting in place.

no concerns

I do not support secondary suites in all urban zones for the following reasons:
- Safety: I do not believe permitting a secondary suite as permitted use will result in people constructing secondary suites to meet building code. The true cost of building a secondary suite within an existing home, is bringing the suite up to code, at a significant cost.

- Poor planning: Simply allowing suites to occur anywhere within Kamloops’ helter-skelter Urban area will result in suites being located farther from core employment areas, amenities, and services. This will result in increase number of private vehicle trips - increase in GHG. Rental and secondary suites should be focused around areas within close proximity of existing employment and service centres to enable walking and cycling.

Myths and lack of data: The city does not have sufficient data to inform policy on secondary suites - does the city track absorption of residential units? Does the city have any data on the number and location of illegal suites in the city? With close to 1,000 purpose built rental apartments coming on stream within the next year, is there a need for a gross rezoning approach. Simply rezoning all urban lands for secondary suites does not equate to affordable housing.


**Comments (Continued)**

Road congestion
greater chance of unsavory characters living in your neighbourhood that
don't take pride in ownership
with a greater population, it puts pressure on schools, hospitals, and other
tax payer funded services

Parking
Property values (houses with suites cost more than houses without,
forcing people to rent them out)
Overburden on community resources (schools, etc that weren’t built for
population size, quiet residential roads with twice as many cars driving up
and down)

1) Untidy and messy yards
2) Parking cluttering the streets and making it unsafe for kids riding bikes
3) Lowering my property value if there are too many suites near me and
having landlords that just don’t care about the property as is in many
cases.

Parking
Extra Traffic

1) Increased pressure on shared community resources (roads, parks) in
desirable areas with higher density
2) More single-family residential homeowners acting as landlords with
little education or experience dealing with the Residential Tenancy
Act what
3) Fewer vacancies for residential tenants as homeowners opt for high-
turnover AirBnB rentals over longer tenancies

Parking
School capacity

1) My concern is strata restriction on suit rental max capacity of 5 in my
building of 42 suits. This should not be a strata regulation, should be City
or Provincial.
2) Strata not allowing rental of a room in my own ie. Airbnb or TRU
exchange students while I am home and living in the unit. Strata says that
my apartment downtown is not zoned for this.
Housing options are a spectrum and with certain rules/regs it can be
managed when done correctly. I am a single occupant/owner, but do
not have a partner to support cost of living, I should not be penalized
because I am single. Housing is very difficult to find and support on your
own if you are a single professional worker.

Parking
Parking
Parking
The suite must have off street parking.

My one concern is that the size restrictions can make the costs of
construction prohibitive. If building a garden or carriage suite it is
probably going to cost at least $100,000. I would imagine that most
people are going to want to be able to fit 2 bedrooms and that’s tough
given the slotted size maximums. Maybe lots of a certain size could be
given a little more square footage for new suite construction?

Parking
Noise
Property value

Traffic
Parking

- parking
- school overpopulation
- unpredictable and unstable school catchments
Comments (Continued)

Parking
Transit - will the city be aware of the location of these suites and able to plan transit accordingly
Investor-owned suites where both the primary and secondary suites are rented. This drives up the price of housing stock as a small group of owners scoop up more and more houses, add suites and rent them. This makes it more difficult for first-time buyers to enter the market.

Parking, extra noise, poor maintenance.

1. Suites will be used as a short term rental. (Airbnb etc.)
2. Parking on residential streets is already horrible in some areas of town.

- Noise
- Cars parked on street
- Safety

Parking is a major concern for me, especially if the property already has issues with lack of parking.

Parking, increased garbage collection limits

Parking is my only concern

Parking and traffic congestion
Maintenence of building standards
Crime (I am admittedly not versed on whether stats bear out a relationship between increased density due to secondary suites and the crime rate).

Parking is already a concern on Dunrobin drive. Constant traffic of renter’s coming and going creates noise pollution as well as a danger to kids in our area. Our houses are already too close to each other we do not need to cram even more people and vehicles in here.

My concern would be that the tenant complies with the guidelines of the homeowner and be respectful with all Neighbours around.

Adequate parking

Nice neighborhoods being run down. People living in the basement suites do not have any vested interest in the neighborhood as the people who have purchased their home do. This change in zoning is not fair for people who have purchased homes knowing that basement suites were not allowed. I lived in a nice neighborhood where this transition happened and I ended up living beside Penticton’s most wanted (2 years in a row). Because the basement suite was legal I was unable to do anything. If the suite had remained illegal I would have simple had to phone in to bylaws and ‘most wanted’ would have had to move.

THIS IS A VERY BAD MOVE KAMLOOPS AND IS SO UNFAIR TO THE EXISTING LAND TAX PAYERS

Increased traffic

Parking is already difficult in our neighbourhood. When it snows and we pile our snow in the only available parking areas on the street, it is even worse. When we bought, it was single family home and people had a bit more pride in their homes and yards. Not all renters have that pride. Thirdly, Homes with suites raise the value of your home and increases taxes.

Noise
Congestion
Traffic

bad tenants
**Comments (Continued)**

Parking has to be accommodated on the lot NOT the street.

There are too many people parking on my street and it is no longer safe for my kids to ride their bikes.

There should be overnight restrictions for parking on street if this goes through.

1. Suites typically are cheaper than apartments, have less rigorous screening/competition; therefore, undesirable renters potentially can cause problems for the community re: noise/nuisance/ unsightly yards/improper storage/garbage disposal/lack of snow clearing on sidewalks and driveways etc. Changes to the Residential Tenancy Act need to be made to protect landlords and surrounding community from problem people. Changes to city bylaws need to protect landlords and community from aforementioned problems.

2. Prohibit the use of secondary suites as short term accommodation (AirBnB) and provide tax breaks to owner occupied properties as they are more likely to be managing the property closely and are not investors / slum landlords.

3. Insufficient parking and number of bylaw officers to address concerns / issues

4. Bylaws regarding suite size/composition; restricting carriage suites to appropriate areas only to avoid ruining neighbour’s views

None! Do it!

Parking, absentee landlords, crime

---

No parking

Noise and extra traffic. Two houses next door to me have illegal secondary suites so I have firsthand experience. With shared driveways and little parking it destroys the quiet enjoyment of my own home. In many parts of the downtown area there is limited or not street parking which exacerbates the situation.

Parking

Absentee landlords

Renters with no vested interest in our neighbourhood

Noise, parking, excessive number of occupants.

No concerns about allowing secondary suites assuming adequate parking exists for additional suites.

I believe it is a positive way to help out with the small amount of rental options in this town.

Parking

For first time home buyers with the mortgage law changes, it is important. The price of homes have risen to a point it is difficult for people to get into home ownership.

Parking

I don’t have any concerns. I’m a millennial in my late twenties who rents a pretty brutal illegal basement suite, and would love for there to be more options in the city. We are stuck where we are as one of us is going to school and we can’t afford to pay over $1200 for a rental.

Parking

Nothing, it is desperately needed for a critical housing shortage.

Off street parking is mandatory for all suites. I have created ample parking at my home. Parking on streets should not be the norm.
Comments (Continued)

Parking.
Affordability, often landlords charge more rent when they split a home into two suites than they would if they rented the whole house as a single dwelling.
Lack of entire homes with no suite for families to rent.

I agree with these suites. As a renter I think they will benefit
1. There will be more available renting space which will encourage more students and working class members to move to Kamloops.
2. They provide a more independent form of living, especially for students, who in many cases are mistreated while living in a home, often their first time renting.
3. With more available suites in the city, it could promote lower renting costs.

Parking must be on property not street.

1. The lack of parking, streets with cars parked on both sides. I feel homeowner must have parking spot on their property for tenant.
2. Increase in crime, low income tenant brings higher amount of traffic, risk, exposure.
3. Tax evasion, homeowners with suites collect cash rent and do not declare the income to Revenue Canada.

Parking, as our street has lots of secondary suites already, mostly used by university students from what I can see. However next to me has rentals and they park directly in front of my house bordering on my lawn. Of course it is public parking but it is still a concern for full time use, unlike when visitors park there.

None

Tenant safety

The City collecting appropriate taxes from a suite as we know there are suites in the City that are cash in the home owners pockets; Builders pay to have suites zoned properly and the City has turned a blind eye to illegal suites. How will the City refund Builders?
Parking; Noise; Will the house be owner occupied vs just a house full of suites which is conducive to not being neighbourly. When this occurs tenants are less likely to mow lawns, shovel snow or care for the neighbourhood / people in their area.

Parking on streets instead of driveways hinders road maintenance crews.
Increased traffic. Safety for children at play, pedestrians, cyclists.

Parking, Some houses are rentals and also have suites, the area can become transient quickly with rentals moving in and out. When you go to sell your home, being able to have a suite may appeal to some, but not to others, this could deter people. Not everyone wants to live on a street where it’s bumper to bumper cars, it junks the neighbourhood up fast.

Off street parking should be available

None

No concerns

1) adequate parking to keep vehicles off the road
2) I would want the process to be as easy as possible for people with the least amount of Renos required (for instance to re-do all the ceilings (for insulation) and to bring the original construction up to current code might be cost prohibitive)

Parking - the secondary suite cannot congest the streets, snow removal and visibility is compromised.
Water restrictions due to increased usage.
Overcrowding in school catchment areas

Building permits
Comments (Continued)

Traffic, our street in Aberdeen is already overflowing with vehicles. Safety will be a concern with more congestion will come more accidents and issues. Crime will probably increase. Our quiet street has already been transformed into a constant parade of vehicles coming and going from neighbours and zooming up and down the road all day and night. Getting very annoying.

Parking

1. Parking
2. Efficient snow removal on streets where there is congested parking due to suites.
3. Neighbourhood disputes as a result of tenant vehicles not having sufficient space to park at the suited residence.

Lack of rules to protect landlords from the tenancy act. Concerned about being able to remove problem tenants in a timely manner.

Tenants must not be allowed to park at the neighbours’ home area including the streets where the neighbours are situated.

Parking is my only concern

Don’t have any.
For citizens to say parking and cars would be an issue is unreasonable since most families have two or more vehicles.

Parking, parking, parking
Disruption of neighbourhood community feeling as in more transient population and renters who do not have a stake in the neighbourhood
Buying into a neighbourhood that did not allow any suites.....per covenants from the developer.....and the city then allows suites.....bought here because it was a FAMILY community.

Parking.
Noise.
Crowded spaces.

1. Parking

parking

There must be parking off the street
They must be legal so that owners pay their share of utilities

Obscuring another’s views, I believe a permit is valuable to make sure his is adhered too!
Very very very important. To keep friendly neighbours.

Parking
Multiple suites
Safety...too many cars become a prob for kids and firetrucks

Parking, population density, better public transportation.

Parking, too many people in smaller suites.

Availability of parking
Base construction of suites (legality of suites)

Parking, snow removal on streets with excessive vehicles, comply with noise bylaws.
### Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parking and the amount of people living in rental houses and suites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No concerns, I believe there is not enough rent-able units available in the city between having university students, families and the overall growth rate of the city. |

| Building code requirements and parking requirements. The vast majority of suites in Kamloops are non-conforming already. Most houses that can physically have a suite usually already do. They are non-conforming mostly because they would not meet building code requirement for a suite and would not have enough room for parking. |

| None, it would help the rental market. |

| Available on street parking, lack of city bus availability for students or others renting suites |

| Parking. |
| Degradation of my neighborhood. |
| Noise |

| Safety...i.e. exit doors/windows in case of fire, electrical, mold etc. |
| Congestion on street from too many vehicles. |
| Property values decreased if too many rentals in one area. |

| Parking. |
| Parking and |
| Parking |

| Parking, pets, illegal activities |

| None. This is the right move |

| I have no concerns. I believe with housing costs rising for buyers and the lack of affordable housing for renters allowing secondary suites is an excellent plan. |

| Parking. |
| Parking. |

| While most are non-conforming, I believe the current regulations and building codes go too far and unnecessary in creating an enjoyable and safe living space for owners and their tenants. |

| Parking would be the only concern |

| I do not have any concerns, I think it would be an excellent initiative for the city! |

| Quality/design of suite |
| Tenant Mix |
| Suites built to code |

| -Parking |
| -The quietness and enjoyment of the neighborhood |
| -soon ppl will not even bother with bl permits of any kind from the City permit fees would now be gone, which City collected?? |

| Increased traffic on an existing quiet street which may be a potential hazard for children or anyone walking on the street. |
| Increased number of cars parked on street resulting in decreased sight lines when driving and decreased aesthetic appeal. |
| With increased rentals comes the potential for decreased care in property maintenance and potential decreased property values. |

| None. I’m in favour of increased density. |

| We already have 6 illegal suites on our street of only 10 houses. The parking problem is horrendous and entirely unsafe. There are sometimes up to 8 extra vehicles parked on a street. It is bad enough year round, but in the winter it is a huge safety problem and snow plowing hazard. Unless there is off street parking available, then no suites should be allowed. |

| Egress, onerous safety rules. |
Comments (Continued)

Congestion of cars, animals, and people. Noise and too much traffic. Renters as a rule don’t take care of properties as well as owners.

Parking. Increased traffic. Homes turning into slum areas.

Parking
Greedy landlords over-pricing
Parking

Rent control

Overcrowding in neighbourhoods including parking issues. Reduction of my property value

- parking
- multi families in areas built only to accommodate single family areas
- transportation and emergency preparedness

Top concern is parking. If you cannot provide a parking spot on your property you should not have a suite e.g. Saddleback in Batchelor. Cars are parked on both sides of the street and it is difficult for vehicles to pass.

Traffic, types of enforcement for neighbors with bad tenants

1. Density, increasing traffic and parking issues. There is little off street parking in most residential areas of Kamloops.
2. This would encourage vacation rentals and absentee landlords, who don’t live in our community but will profit if this is allowed.
3. Many renters do not care for a property or about their neighbors. Neglected yards, loud parties, barking dogs, etc.

Parking

1. Degradation of quality of construction of secondary suite
2. Degradation of overall residential character or desirability of residential zone
3. Increase in number of off-site parking on lanes and streets

None

street parking
busy streets
denser population

1) Bylaw enforcement of parking
2) Bylaw enforcement of nuisance properties.
3) Better laws to protect landlords and their property, not bad tenants.

1. Parking for suite occupants MUST be on landlord’s property and NOT on street.
2. Suite MUST have valid permit/occupancy from city to ensure safety for renters as well as neighbours.
3. Landlords MUST obtain written, verifiable references from renters to be submitted to city for review if necessary.

I have no concerns.

vehicles parking in front of my lot that don’t live/visit at my house, too many people in too small an area, additional pollution from additional vehicles

Parking/but if the owner parks in garage then parking should not be an issue.
Comments (Continued)

1. Parking! Parking is already extremely congestion due to illegal suites on our street. Tenant’s vehicles parked on the street narrow the roadway making it dangerous to drive especially around corners. The tenant’s vehicles make the street single lane rather than a two lane street as it was intended. The street was not planned for so many vehicles to be parked there all the time.

2. Snow removal in Aberdeen is affected by the number of tenant vehicles parking on residential streets which make effective snow removal next to impossible. We receive generous amounts of snow in Aberdeen making it a problem for half of the year.

3. Reduce neighbourhood livability. We purchased a home and moved into our neighbourhood because it was mostly single family homes which is where we chose to live. If one is not able to purchase a home without an income suite then one may have to purchase a home in a more affordable area or at a more affordable price. Many people select to live in lower population density areas as a preference rather than living in a higher population density area which is a reasonable personal choice. Adding secondary suites to neighbourhoods increases population density which is not always desirable by homeowners.

- Waste management, parking, increased crime
- Parking is the main concern.
- Parking, proper share of taxes and utilities
- No concerns--we need more affordable housing of all types.
- Parking. Fire hazards. Rent amount
- parking
- privacy
- Safety

1. Street parking. Property owner must have space on their property for rental vehicles.
2. Property is large enough and able to provide parking space without looking like a used car lot.
3. Any building conforms with existing neighboring properties.

- Parking/congestion
- illegal suites
- very small sq ftage for secondary suites

Noise from extra vehicles, noise from parties, suite inhabitants that are unknown to neighbors and constantly changing

- Noise
- Parking
- Loss of privacy

- Parking on streets and traffic congestion
- Snow clearing because of street parking
- Lower the value of single family homes without suites

- Safe and available parking

Parking, restricted landlord rights, lack of city services in Dallas, Campbell Creek, Westsyde etc

- 1. Street parking which is already limited
- 2. Adequate building permit oversight of all new secondary suites
- 3. Increased city expense to provide #2

Parking
Noise
Inconsiderate neighbors

Parking
Loss of privacy
Loss of neighbourhood atmosphere
Comments (Continued)

Parking density  
Safety concerns  
Suites do not fit neighbourhood  
I bought and paid for single family dwelling over 35 yrs  
By choice  
Complete waiving of rules incorrect

1) Get rid of the ridiculous frontage rule for homeowners so they may increase off-street parking, i.e. pave/cement entire street frontage.  
2) The city will increase property taxes based on having a second living suite (unfair taxation)  
3) An increase in rental suites will have a huge economic benefit for the city, increase rental competition lowering rental rates for lower income, decrease homelessness and provide more financial flexibility for overtaxed homeowners.

Increased traffic on street and creates parking problems  
Renters change the makeup of the neighbourhood.  
Decreases value of neighbouring property.

- Overflow Parking  
- Crime increasing  
- area becomes investment properties not family dwellings

Parking, Parking Parking  
Proper permitting and follow up inspections  
neighbourhood esthetics

Parking (needs to be off street), Suite access must not interfere with neighbours (to enter the suite next door to use requires either entering through the garage or walking down the side of the house which means walking on our property), Privacy (tenants should not brother neighbouring property due to additional noise, etc.). Carriage Home designs need to fit into existing neighbourhood. (need to look like they belong, no modern in older neighbourhoods)

Increased transience and crime in my neighbourhood.  
Strange comings and goings in my neighbourhood.  
Lack of commitment to neighbourhood and loss of community feel.

1) Parking! Off-street Parking should be required, with max occupancy rules established.  
2) Lack of enforcement of policies related to secondary suites. If we move towards a system that makes having a secondary suite easier, then we also need increase enforcement of illegal suites to bring them into compliance.  
3) Protection of long term rental stock. We need to develop policies to restrict short term (AirBnB) style rentals.

Congestion, more parking on the streets, and possibly in time overcrowding of local schools

1. Traffic and Parking  
2. Absentee landowners and property standards dropping due to poor care  
3. Rising housing costs due to more people getting into market and using suites to leverage the mortgage. It does not mean more affordable housing

Every second house in my neighborhood has a suite in it. I pay taxes for Single Family Residence but am living in a high density area. There not enough parking spaces. Lots of extra noise etc.
**Comments (Continued)**

No concerns- I encourage suites and would challenge that my property with 2 suites and a carriage house uses less utilities together (sewer, water, garbage, electricity) than most single family homes alone. It is the habits within the residence that makes impact rather than the number of residences.

PROPERTY value, landlord agreements, keeping up with property standards

None

Parking

Parties

Congestion

Parking. Taking care of properties

Parking issues, I live across the street from a residence with a basement suite. I have counted at times 6 vehicles with association to that residence. They often occupy the gratis street parking that is in front of other residences including my own! There should be a by law that if there isn’t enough parking in the residence driveway then the suite should be cancelled or not allowed at all.

No issues. Suites allow more efficient use of the home and offer an acceptable rental rate for younger people. Many people have such large homes with only 2 people living in them. That’s a waste of energy and resources.

Parking disputes, too many pets, uncontrolled smoking

street parking, noise complaints, more crime

On street parking. Renters not taking care of their yards.

1. Ensure there is enough parking (e.g. the lots are big enough to handle a suite)
2. Ensure landlords take care of landscaping of homes that are completely tenanted (e.g. upstairs and downstairs rented - landlord doesn’t occupy home).
3. Garbage pick-up is a pain when you have a tenant. They should be allowed their own garbage bins so you don’t have to share.

Parking on the street as it is becoming more difficult to drive up and down Aberdeen streets with all the extra cars, etc. Winter is particularly challenging as the side streets become very narrow. Perhaps no parking on at least one side of residential streets should be considered as was done on Howe Road off of Pacific.

No concerns

Rent increases due to the increased fees and taxes imposed upon landlords.

1. Parking. Far too many streets are congested with tenant’s cars. Make it mandatory to have parking for renters on the property.  
2. While suites allow some buyers to afford to own a home it also drives home prices up.
3. Increased noise. Lots in many areas are already fairly tight. I moved to less populated area for peace and quiet.

Ensuring people legalize existing illegal suites. Making carriage house permitting and approval easier to obtain. Construction is completed competently and suites are safe.

no concerns
Comments (Continued)

1) Too many vehicles parked on major bus route streets
2) Too many vehicles parked on all streets
3) Concerns with problem renters

no concerns other than parking

I have an older home, I don’t know if we ever could upgrade enough to have a legal suite.

Pets (dogs barking, cats pooping in garden beds, etc.)
Parking
Noise (trucks without mufflers, parties, etc.)

PARKING AND PEOPLE THAT RENT ARE HISTORICALLY LESS LIKELY TO TAKE CARE OF THEIR SURROUNDINGS AND THEREFORE CAUSE A DEVALUING OF OUR PROPERTIES.

If you can’t afford a house buy a cheaper one so I do not have other people’s cars blocking my driveway. If you have a suite please provide parking on your property.
Increased traffic where children play is troublesome.
I can’t see to back out of my driveway if cars are lined up.

1. Parking congestion
2. Construction quality/ safety standards.

1. Sufficient space for parking
2. Increased traffic, congestion
3. Abuse of system by Investment houses being rented out to multiple renters

Parking
Tiny lot sizes of Kamloops

Parking access when people have more than 2 vehicles and choose street parking. With a senior in my home with mobility issues it is important that neighbours are sensitive to our need to park in front of the house. House had no parking off alley when I purchased it. Backyard parking should be encouraged somehow especially if more garden suites and carriage houses are allowed not to mention the development of apartment blocks in the area.

Suites are fine however owners must provide off street parking so that our roads are not taken up by renters who have little concern for the neighbourhood. Also, keeping vehicles off the road provides for better snow clearing and clearing of sidewalks and access corridors to homes. As well the City must consider the equity consideration of additional impacts to crowding in neighbourhoods. If suites are going to be permitted the owners MUST occupy the home and not rent out the entire dwelling. If homes are in total rented out home owners with earned equity have no control of who enters their neighbourhood which could also affect equity earned for many of us over many years.

Parking
Noise
Compatibility

If there is adequate parking, then that is great, but if every house had a suite and the renters all parked on the street it would be over crowded. All houses, condo’s, townhouses, should have parking for their vehicles off of the street. The street should be for short term parking only.
Unfair taxation - If there are two households living on one property, then I hope that they would be paying the equivalent of two taxes.

1. Transition of existing non-compliant suites.
2. Expense / bureaucracy / red tape in permitting a legal suite.
3. Whining NIMBYers.
### Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am certainly in favour of expanding the current zoning bylaws for suites, my only concern is parking issues that we already have getting worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concerns. Many suites already exist now outside allowed areas. Without these suites we would not be able to have the number of TRU students we currently have. Only minor concern is on street parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. My major concern is the Parking. If the house wants a rental suite then they should supply parking on their driveway. Our neighbours rentals have sometimes 2 to 3 vehicles which plugs up the street and in the winter very difficult for the city snow removal.  
2. Sometimes renters can be short term and not knowing who the people are could be a safety concern.  
3. I agree that permits should be applied for along with inspections. In our case, does our neighbours house insurance cover renters. If the renters were to have started a fire and it burned parts or all of our house would the homeowners insurance cover ours too? |
| Parking, traffic, and congestion |
| Parking |
| That there is only one extra car needing parking. That there be a ma the maximum amount of people in the house. You should have to live in that house as well so you are aware of anything your tenant does. That would stop 90 percent of complaints. |
| Parking |
| They should pay much higher taxes water sewer garbage infringing on my property i.e. parking on my boulevard |
| PARKING |
| PARKING |
| PARKING |
| off street parking |
| ensuring sufficient off street parking access for emergency vehicles and personnel - fire, police, ambulance impact on school district enrollment |
| Primarily, parking. Residential streets are designed to allow space for some curb parking, but NOT to allow bumper to bumper parking on both sides. Some curb parking allows vehicles to give way to opposing cars to get through. Too many cars and this becomes unmanageable. Add in snow removal and there's a real problem as there is not enough space to store snow AND park more than the odd car on the curb. Secondary to the above comment, I don’t want to see landscaping requirements reduced. Converting a front yard to a parking lot isn’t acceptable. Finally, suites will change the demographics of the neighbourhood. It may sound elitist, but I bought in a nice neighbourhood because I like the quiet and the lack of crime. Someone looking for trouble stands out. If suites become common, it won’t be the same quiet neighbourhood. And with so many people - likely younger - wandering around, it won’t be easy to know who belongs there and who doesn’t. So yeah, I get that this comment makes me sound intolerant or uppity, but I didn’t buy a home in an expensive neighbourhood so I could rub shoulders with methadone people. I won’t apologize for that either. |
| Parking is my only concern |
| No concerns. I lived in suites for many years. They are necessary for people who can’t afford homes. |
Comments (Continued)

1. Rental houses that are not owner occupied.
2. Transient neighbours.
3. The demise of neighbourhoods.
You paint a pretty picture of affordable housing and mortgage helper but that’s just not the reality.

1. Street parking congestion in winter months
2. Increase in traffic noise

Parking
Traffic
Noise/Smoking

None

1. There needs to be off-street parking for suite dwellers
2. Increased traffic is a concern
3. Rental clientele, especially in the case of absentee/out of town landlords

1. Off-street parking
2. When we moved to Kamloops we told our real estate agent to look for houses in those areas not zoned to have suites. How is someone moving to Kamloops able to do this in the future?

Drug (marijuana) use, parking, difficulties evicting bad tenants.

Increased taxes. Unsatisfied neighbors, change to property value.

Overcrowding, lack of parking.

I think it’s a great idea! I don’t rent my basement suite out, as well as many I know because of all of this.

1. Parking
2. As a former landlady of several units in Kamloops I am aware of many problems caused by tenants. They have invested only half a month’s rent, unlike an owner who has a great deal of money. About half of renters I have dealt with over the last 50 years do not take reasonable care of property.
3. Limited control who landlords can refuse to rent to people. New landlords would be surprise that they have to rent to people they do not wish to but must rent to them according to Landlord Tenant act.

None

No concerns, this is really needed

1. How many will be pet friendly?
2. Will there be reasonable rents?
3. If pet friendly, how many will allow dogs?

People buying and chopping up houses into upstairs and downstairs suites, removing houses from the rental market for families that need more space. Driving up real estate pricing up as more landlords continue to buy up existing properties to chop up.

1. Off street parking is a must for secondary streets. It is difficult now on some streets to drive on because the number of vehicles from secondary illegal suites narrow the roads to one lane. Off street parking for suites would also make it considerably easier for city snowplows to navigate.
2. Both new and old suites MUST conform to the same rules. I have been in illegal suites that are both a fire hazard and lacking windows!
3. The owners must be taxed at a higher rate. Most illegal suite homeowners are collecting tax free/non reported income, all the while putting strain on city services. The illegal suite sub culture must be regulated.

I have no concerns! I have lived in rented secondary suites for most of my adult life, and I am grateful that this is being considered as it would open up many more options!
Comments (Continued)

Parking
Safety of neighborhoods

Parking
Road traffic
Noise

None really, the city needs to have more rental space

None.

Insufficient parking; inadequate transit. Current illegal suites - how will the City find these and ensure they meet current safety codes like they do for all those who spent the money to comply with safety regulations and building codes, and applied for permits to ensure they were able to offer a safe suite for rent? I could have easily left the suite the way it was when we bought our house and made a lot of money without laying any out to bring it up to code, and I worry that anyone will be able to slap up a wall or two and say they have a suite to rent.

1. increase in street parking
2. increase in traffic on an otherwise quiet street
3. rentals at times bring undesirables

None

Slumlords

Parking, noise, litter

N/a

Congestion/parking
Landlords not following rules/bylaws/zoning

Prohibitive regulation requirements for existing homeowners with suites.

I’m concerned about the on street parking x 3

Community safety / calibre of tenants

Parking
Housing costs

No concern

1. Additional taxes by city
2. Absentee landlords who do not properly vet their tenants
3. Parking in commercial/ residential mixed neighbourhoods

Parking on my street, bad and noisy tenants, increased traffic

Street parking

First the current illegal suites need to be regulated and the current illegal suites need to pay the taxes they are costing the city. We pay the same tax rate as a property with an illegal suite and we don’t have a suite for rent. Is that fair? Second there needs to be some accountability of the city that has allowed this current circumstance to continue creating this unfair tax situation. Third there are a lot of illegal suites currently operating with no regulation, there needs to be some enforcement of the permit process regarding these suites not just simply granting a grandfathering or amnesty to the current illegal suites that are everywhere.

Parking

Parking would be the only concern

Street Parking, Extra Congestion, and Extra Noise.

Parking
Nothing else

Street parking
Comments (Continued)

High rent cost
Lack of pet friendly suites

1. Parking
2. Noise
3. Upkeep and maintenance

1) PARKING ON THE STREET. This prevents proper snow removal and winter/spring maintenance as well as access for emergency vehicles. Also, the majority of homeowner garages are used for storage purposes hence reducing off street parking further. Factoring in that a suite has the potential for 2 car occupants, in addition to the homeowner probably having 2 vehicles, there’s no way off street parking would be viable, forcing cars to be parked on the street. The size of most property lots are not large enough to accommodate off street parking for suites for one thing. Then there is the issue where visitors should park which just compounds this issue. A two lane street becomes a narrow one lane eyesore hard to maneuver. A homeowner such as myself, who doesn’t have a suite all of a sudden the parking in front of my house is used for the neighbour’s suite and my guests have no place to park. This pits neighbour against neighbour. You will have different cars battling for parking position on a street and ultimately resulting in vehicle front end and rear end damage with increase in ICBC premiums and claims. Just take a look at what’s happened in Surrey and the Willoughby area of Langley for allowing secondary suites. They’re trying to reverse the mess they allowed. Secondary Suites will not retain the character of residential streets.

2) SUITES SHOULD NOT BE USED AS A MONEY MAKER OR MORTGAGE HELPER for the homeowner nor at the expense of other residents. (because of aforementioned concerns) You have to qualify for a mortgage and as such should be able to afford your home. 

3) OVERCROWDING IN SCHOOLS because of the nonaccountability of suite occupancy

4) QUESTIONABLE, PROBLEM TENANTS.

Parking,

Extra tax
Parking
Infrastructure delivery capabilities

Landlords must declare the income and pay taxes accordingly. This issue is an issue of fairness, far-reaching fairness. The immediate concerns are in regards to extra noise and congestion on otherwise quaint residential streets. The other issue is in regards to urban planning. The City and council need to work on encouraging building smaller, more affordable homes and re-think the development/urban sprawl model.

1. Parking and congestion on the street
2. Increased traffic on Juniper Hill and through Valleyview
3. School over capacity

ease of process
rezoning

Parking, and increase in noise from more vehicle traffic. More city services will be required (i.e. sewer, water, garbage, etc.). Owners of suites should pay for these additional services.

As a renter and a parent most of these suites are not fire safe. Lack of exits and tiny windows. THIS NEEDS TO CHANGE.

Parking congestion on residential streets, noise infractions, accountability and policing of suite legality

As a current tenant, my concerns would only be parking and private space. At my current place we have plenty of outdoor space and parking, but I see many ads with no available parking. This is a problem in a city where most people drive.

1. Parking
2. Declaration of suites (no guidelines)
3. Regulation related to safety (quality of construction / services)
Comments (Continued)

Size of suites e.g. very small not enough room for comfort. Entrances at ground level for elderly folk as well as handicapped folk and persons that are unable to move about comfortably (back problems, arthritis, etc), reasonable rent prices that are affordable.

Parking off street a must
Suites must be inspected for building code adherence and safety aspects, i.e. fire exits...this needs to be done for existing non-compliance suites as well as new suites.
Owners need to realize being a landlord is not a slam dunk, need to be vigilant when screening tenants as Tenancy act is slanted to the tenant.

1. Off street parking
2. Meet building codes, access and egress, electrical, plumbing etc.
3. Limit number of persons according to suite design. i.e. 6 people in a one bedroom suite.

1. parking, which might compromise access to neighbours own parking.
2. Inconsiderate or noisy tenants.
3. Additional traffic, perhaps at various times of night.

I don’t have concerns about allowing secondary suites as I am not a home owner and frankly it’s more important to me that there be more rentals available in Kamloops. As a renter, my concern would be the high rental prices on these suites, making them unaffordable to many.

1) Absentee landlords who do not maintain the property.
2) Home owners who have no idea how to deal with problem renters, or choose to ignore issues like drug use just to collect rental income. Being a home owner does not mean that a person will be a responsible landlord.
3) The constant rotation of renters is also a concern - moving trucks loading and unloading every few months.

Overcrowding and noise
Parking

Parking
quality renters (require a police record check)
Enforcement of rules

Parking
Crowding
Parties

Off street parking
Health and safety of renters
Limit on #of renters in one house

-Street parking,
-not allowed in a Cul-de-sac

Nil

1) Space in Valleyview high school. They are already bursting at the seams. Classes are not optimal for learning and students have to share lockers. This school was not meant to house the number of students it currently has.
2) parking
3) garbage/recycling

Increased traffic
Cars parked on the street narrowing the road to traffic
Not usually long term tenants and care little about noise, speeding other thing that I pay very high and ever increasing taxes to have

Parking. If my neighbors were to install a suite, OFF ROAD parking should be all that’s permitted (there needs to be parking on the property’s land in a driveway) and not on the street.

Adequate parking. We have too many vehicles now clogging our streets due to inadequate parking. Snow clearing is challenging in some areas including Lower Sahali due to this issue. How will you address this? Secondly increased traffic in residential areas and school zones. Thirdly, increased noise due to number two!
**Comments (Continued)**

Crime  
Parking  
Traffic increase

| THERE NEEDS TO BE PROPER SAFETY INSPECTIONS AND PROOF OF IT. There should be proper parking spots. Underground basement suites without proper windows and exits should be shut down. Basement suites in townhouses should be shut down. Too much parking congestion and fire risk in a confined area. Landlords also shouldn’t be allowed to turn duplexes into 4plexes. FAMILIES NEED SPACE NOT A SHOE BOX. THE CITY NEEDS TO CHANGE ITS RULES ON TWO CATS PER HOUSEHOLD. AN UPSTAIRS AND DOWN STAIRS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED 2 HOUSEHOLDS. STOP DISCRIMINATING. |

| Increased taxes, parking, increased regulations |

I have only one concern. I have a neighbour with a basement suite. The suite is not even close to being safe. When I inquired through several transfers of numbers as to who is responsible for what is the inspection process. I finally was able to talk someone. Very nice fellow. Here is what I got told. Anyone wanting to report a concern regarding a secondary suite has to live within 100 meters of the property. So even if you have a concern and you are over the 100 meters away your concern does not count. They have to send a letter describing the concerns to the city. If the city inspector receives the 2 required letters on the same suite within a certain time period then there MIGHT be an inspection done. The 2 required letters are a bylaw in place to ensure that the complaint is not a neighbour dispute. So even though my neighbour’s suite poses a high safety risk to the owner and tenant there is nothing I can do. Yes I did send my letter. I was able to talk with another neighbour, and that neighbour did send a second letter. It has been months, NO Inspection done. So the point of this is to show we have no system in place to monitor or inspect secondary suites.

| No concerns |

Parking. Huge impact on our tiny street where most homes need to park a vehicle on the street, without a tenant. We have 3 illegal suites on our street, with no added parking. No consideration or consultation with neighbors or neighbourhood association.

| Off street parking  
| Fire separation  
| Number of animals permitted |

Road parking, water meter gouging from the city and garbage collection.

| 1. Parking  
| 2. It would put more financial drain on our bare land Strata as each household pays equal share of utilities.  
| 3. We built our home here because it is a single family neighbourhood, not multi family. |

| more cars next door, not knowing who my neighbors are, more noise from extra people and pets |

None. They’re necessary for individuals and families to be able to own a home.

| None |

| 1. School overcrowding resulting in my kids having to go to another school  
| 2. Parking and congestion  
| 3. Rental ability of my rental properties |

No concerns

| Privacy  
| Traffic  
| Safety/theft |
Comments (Continued)

Parking
Congestion
Untrustworthy residents not vetted by income, unable to afford their own home.

I just have one main concern. There are suites in my neighborhood whether legal or not that do not have parking for their tenants. That means their tenants park on the street in front of other people's houses blocking off the ability for some home owners to have visitors because all the street parking is taken up by tenants in other people's homes. I believe if you have a suite on your property you must provide parking on your property as well, not on the street.

- parking
- increased traffic
- possibility of being too transient

parking, nothing else

Parking, increased traffic, people coming and leaving the community without committing to the community.

Noise
Dogs barking

That the city won't be flexible by adjusting some of the current hurdles (like separate hot water systems, three side-by-side parking spaces, etc.)

Otherwise, none. North Vancouver, Vancouver, Nanaimo, Kelowna, Chilliwack, Prince George, Abbotsford, etc. have already gone down this path in some shape or form. Common concerns like parking, etc., just aren't transpiring like people assume they will.

parking
transient neighbours
crime

1. PARKING
2. Neighborhood school already over capacity
3. Traffic. Neighborhood not designed to have the type of proposed density

Parking could be an issue - however as Kamloops further develops their bus system - that could be mitigated.

The rich will get richer.

The astronomical fees the City will require for permits etc.
The increase in City utilities

My rights as the homeowner

That home prices will rise. I would never buy a home with a suite. I don’t want to live and hear a stranger downstairs.

traffic
safety

Parking, traffic increase

I am opposed to secondary suites in Strata Developments because of:
1. Not permitted by strata regulation and we don’t intend to enact permission
2. Not enough parking.
3. Strata will not be able to control the tenant/visitor transient issues.
4. Road network cannot support more traffic.

Increased noise
Parking
Incomplete infrastructure to support them

Increased demand on aging infrastructure, emergency services and a reduction in the less-congested quality of life we moved here for.
**Comments (Continued)**

Parking we already have too many people parking on the street.
Partying when home owner is away.
Renters don’t care about the community they are renters, everyone should have pride in their community.

Valleview
Sahali
Aberdeen

| Off street parking
Off street parking
Off street parking |
|-------------------|

Front yards turning into parking lots, house prices going up as houses with suites are priced higher than the same house without a suite, neighborliness is gone as renters of suites do not have the same invested interested in their neighborhood as home owners

Appropriate parking on street for additional vehicles
Home owner gets a tax break on the rental income as an incentive
Mandatory/Subsidized credit and criminal check for the home owner to access prior to renting suite

- Infrastructure: water, sewer, roads, schools, etc. not able to meet needs
- Parking on streets
- Multiple suites in the same house
- Absentee landlords

Parking, snow clearing, road width

There should be adequate off-street parking.

---

That rental costs are reduced and more units are available, so the costs of renting will decrease slightly.
That with more diverse options for secondary suites it would lead to some less desirable neighborhoods be revitalized as currently they are not eligible for having a second legal suite that counts toward to mortgage approval.
Some school districts may have a redistribution as more neighborhoods become able to have secondary suites legally.

Parking, parking, parking

There are already huge problems with on street parking in some parts of Aberdeen, and when snow piles up the streets are sometimes barely one lane

1. Must have off street parking.
2. Must comply with fire and building code and permits.

Parking, poorly built suites,

Parking
Not enough infrastructure to accommodate extra traffic

Parking on the streets the roads aren’t big enough.
Sometimes the crime rate goes up in the area because the renters don’t care.
More garbage waste example the renters start to put their waste in other people’s garbage cans cause the landlords don’t want to pay for the bigger garbage cans.

1) Parking
2) Safety (increased fire risk, increase in people coming/going, ability of plow trucks to remove snow adequately around increase in vehicles)
3) Cost to taxpayers
Comments (Continued)

Negative impact on existing property values, changing zoning after we purchased our home.
Lack of off street parking put many extra vehicles and traffic into the residential area.
Tenants do not have the same respect for the community as evident by our experience with parking, speed driving, vehicle noise, large commercial vehicles, vehicles left for over 48 hours, absent landlords to deal with tenant/neighbour complaints.

1. I purchased property and built a home in an area in which suites were not allowed, specifically because I did not want to live in a neighbourhood with suites. If they suites are permitted, the neighbourhood I invested in changes into one like those I deliberately avoided.
2. Increase in traffic and on street parking.
3. Negative change in the type of community I live in. I want to be in a community area that is quiet and not densely populated. Neighbourhood loses the feel of single family dwelling neighbourhood.

Parking/ street access
Bylaws need to crack down on current illegal suites.
Current infrastructure in place to meet the demands.

parking would be my only concern, other than that I support home owners looking for mortgage helpers or a place for their parents or children to live.

On-street parking.
No concerns.

Parking
No building permits (it’s tough to put one in up to code)
Water/sewer

Parking on the street.
Snow removal because of cluttered streets.
Increasing the density and busyness of my quiet neighbourhood.
Getting riff raft and unknown, lower class/SES neighbours.

Adequate parking. not low income pricing as we already have problems in Valleyview with theft by people living in certain cheap motels in our area (every night)

1. Owners who cannot afford to update their suites to the bc building code standards.
2. Enforcement of suites not to code.
3. Grandfather-in period of bringing suites up to code.

No concerns! You tax us so much we must have suites to buy food

Now!

Parking in areas with small lot sizes with minimal frontage

1) Adequate parking for all vehicles on site and not on the street, especially in cul-de-sacs...danger to children as well as a problem for snow plowing, cleaning and removal during winter months.
2) That proper and legal inspections be carried out by qualified City staff for fire rating as well as building, electrical and plumbing infractions, prior to allowing secondary suites.
3) That no more than 2 dogs or cats per single family dwelling be allowed in the single-family dwelling zone. (Not 2 per each suite allowed.)

There needs to be license and bylaw enforcement. Parking is the biggest issue. There needs to be off street parking required

thorough back ground checks not being done
traffic congestion / lack of bus service

parking
 renter issues - noise, lack of care for neighbourhood

Red tape, cost, and naysayers who complain about parking
Comments (Continued)

Too much red tape.

None

Parking

Parking transient renters
dangerous illegal suites

The costs required to comply with building codes. It would be great if those costs could be subsidized or tax deductible to provide some kind of monetary insensitive for landlords to make their suites compliant and safer.

Parking would be the only concern with suites but affordable rent is more important. I am also in a trades program at TRU and more suites would create more jobs and make Kamloops more affordable for more people to move here.

Parking congestion, noise, bad tenants and bad landlords

More law enforcement regarding people who disobey the law in problem suites, allowing enough housing so that renters can afford to rent, suites have legal set up such as smart meter per tenant.

Parking Bad tenants have too many rights

Street Please/Congestion and kids darting between parked cars (visibility of children).

a) parking
b) parking
c) parking

d) Parking Traffic

School capacities

Available parking (no over-crowding) & trouble-making tenants (when tenants are asked to vacate for good reason, it can be difficult for landlords to have them evicted)

Parking, Permits, and taxes

Parking, overcrowding of schools, traffic

Increase in nuisance behaviours, such as noise. Increased traffic, both in the neighbourhood and collecting/main streets. There already isn’t enough parking in many neighbourhoods. More cars would be parked in front of other people’s houses (reducing visitor parking) and on lawns.

Parking and how the tenant impacts the neighbourhood.

Parking, water and sewer and garbage pick-up.

The cost of construction in order to comply with city codes. The cost of inspections and permits. If I can’t afford these extra costs, going forward will I be at higher risk of having my suite shut down? I can barely afford my bills as is, without the suite I’d have to sell immediately.

Enforcement, costs associated with legalizing a suite, being given a reasonable amount of time to legalize a secondary suite (including sourcing the funds and undertaking any necessary renovations).

Parking, noise, increased traffic.

Parking, noise, unattended pets, pot use

A) Larger sq footage allowance for 3 bedroom suite. Don’t feel families should have to squeeze into 800 sq ft if 1100 is available.
B) Parking
C) what are the building permit requirements? Cost?
Comments (Continued)

Parking

-Safety on narrow streets (more vehicles with children around)
-snow removal with extra cars on the street
-noise issues related to more people in the same space

Parking, devaluing of existing legal suites

1. A suite was permitted in a neighbour’s house. Now they park all over the neighbourhood on the road. There is no assigned or dedicated parking spaces for them on the property. They park on a corner and create dangerous driving conditions and make it difficult on the snow plows cleaning the road. This is unacceptable.
2. I was careful when purchasing a house to ensure it was in a safe and suitable neighbourhood for my family. When lower income families move into previously decent neighbourhoods crime DOES go up. Look at Barnhartvale as a prime example. Let people choose whether they want to rent but they should have to go through stringent public hearings/consultations first so the neighbours have a say on what is going on in their neighbourhoods.
3. Noise. When you have people that do not care, commit, or invest in their neighbourhood they do not care what happens. They will throw parties or contribute to decreased safety in the neighbourhood because they do not care about the people around them.

They should be rated to the same standard of build as the original house, no building code creep.

Parking
Noise
Utility Billing

No concerns- they should be allowed.

The city was charging more for services, such as water and garbage are they still doing this? This is a concern...water and garbage should not be more because there is a suite.

The current residential tenancy act is very one sided in favor of the tenant. It really is risky renting under the current RTA

Parking

Parking, parking, parking

1. Parking
2. Snow clearing on streets (parking)
3. More traffic in congested areas

Parking, noise, and more traffic.

More noise from having more people congested in one area. As well as more cars parked on the streets and noise from more cars. More traffic, we don’t want our nice neighbourhoods turning into apartment blocks

No concerns, it will be nice to have extra housing options on the market.

Parking
Noise
Depreciation of propriety

1. increased number of drug houses
2. increased street parking

I have no concerns. As always, people just need to be respectful of their fellow neighbors.

I have no concerns, more rentals are needed in Kamloops. Homeowners need rentals to be able to afford housing here. It’s the only way I could afford a home with a family of 3 to support.
Comments (Continued)

1. Too many vehicles parked on the street
2. Noise
3. Failure to maintain house and yard

Not concerned about it. We need more suites to make housing affordable. Kamloops also needs more urban density.

Parking. Increase traffic. Brock does not have sidewalks. So walking is dangerous.

Suites should be permitted throughout the city with permitted front yards full of cars, public streets filled with renter’s vehicles

Parking requirements. We already have 3 vehicles so being required to find three more would make it no feasible.

1. I don’t want cars parking in front of my house or heavy traffic in our neighbourhood.
2. Types of renters that would be living in our neighbourhood.

Parking would be a concern for me.

The illegal suites—
Parking
No permits
Not paying share of garbage @ water expenses

Parking
Safe and healthy state of the suite
Too many people in one home

1) Parking - street or otherwise.
2) Number of pets allowed per property

Noise
Parking
Congestion

Attraction of undesirable visitors
Parking
Noise and congestion

Septic fields in Rayleigh, saturation of rental market

Making sure that suites are safe. Enforcing building codes so that renters aren’t being put at risk.

Parking
Parking

Street parking is my main concern in my neighbourhood as I live on the school bus route and with cars parking on both sides of my street and the school kids roaring up and down the street several times a day on a street that now narrowed down to 1 or 1 1/2 it’s normal width. Another concern is the increased activity in the neighbourhood with likely more vehicular traffic at all times of the day and/or night.

1) keeping the densification on routes either close in or with good alternatives to private vehicle commuting, we need to reduce dependence on privately owned vehicles
2) fair handed inspection with a win-win attitude

None. It would be nice for people to have rental options

Parking would be the main concern. We actually had an extra concrete parking spot created for the renter of our suite, as we live on a cul de sac. I think suites are a good idea, but the landlords need to act in a neighbourly way to make this acceptable for all.

Parking, noise and messy neighborhood
Comments (Continued)

-Suites being legal: specifically things like having separate air and electric systems. I rented a secondary suite which did not, and we could smell downstairs’ cigarette habit and if a breaker blew we would have to wait until we could get a hold of them downstairs to flip it.

-Re: suites being legal: even if the city requires permits and an inspection prior to renting, who enforces this so that situations like the one in which I found myself don’t happen? How? On whose dime?

No concerns.

Disruption of a quiet neighbourhood
Unsafe car parking
Unsafe number of cars using quiet streets

Parking
Noise
Congestion

Parking
Transit needs to be more frequent

Overcrowding, more than three dogs at a residence, parking in front of driveways of other houses.

1) Parking
2) Afraid the character of the neighbourhood will be lost
3) Noise or rowdiness from irresponsible renters and absent or uninterested landlords

Safety, parking, and noise

Parking! Parking! Parking!

It’s not anyone’s business what someone else does with their property as long as it’s done properly (i.e. to code). Sufficient parking should also be taken into account.

We purchased our home in a No Suite zone. Our street is a Crescent and the road is narrow. We feel our rights are violated if the several illegal suites on our Crescent become legal. Encouraging more suites in the neighbourhood. This will make our chosen home and Crescent high density and much more traffic. SHOULD THIS HAPPEN OUR TAXES SHOULD BE DECREASED.

Parking, extra utility usage for the City, renters not respecting the local neighbourhood

Parking for Tenants off street
Parking for Visitors
Number of Tenants, Limit? Number of bedrooms allowed limit?
No suites in Cul De Sacs, unless off street parking is provided!

In our neighbourhood I do not have concerns, In newer areas with narrower streets and smaller lots I could see parking becoming a large issue.

Parking
Noise
Curb appeal

1) Proper allowances made for parking. Parking should be off-street where possible.

Noise, not following garbage/cleanliness requirements, turning into Airbnb type rentals.

Parking
That old suites will be subject to new rules

Parking, parking and parking. I want to be able to pull into my driveway without having to go around double parked cars, cars parked illegally and because of the over parked cars the snow cannot be plowed to the curb.

Parking is a big concern
**Comments (Continued)**

1. No concerns, there are already countless unauthorized suites in Kamloops. A process that legitimizes suites and encourages people to have well-built suites is a good idea.

- Parking
- Traffic
- Noise

Street parking. Secondary suites should have to provide on property parking, or street parking in front of your own home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No concerns, our city needs more affordable housing options as well as mortgage helpers for young families to be able to afford to buy a home.

1) Not being able to find a home that isn’t suited when looking to purchase a home. As I’m not interested in having tenants.
2) Street parking overcrowding. There should be regulation, as there are with a home business that require an off street parking spot for the tenant.
3) Illegal suites which can be troublesome to a new buyer of a home.

None, the suites are already there!

1. Parking must be available on the property not on the street
2. Pressure on already overcrowded schools
3. Lack of good public transportation

1. Safety of the residents living in the suite in regards to fire and building code requirements;
2. Parking for both principal residents and suite residents are provided without impacting the availability of on street parking within neighbourhoods;
3. Suites that exist that do not comply are penalized or decommissioned; there has to be an incentive for people that choose to follow the permits, rules, zoning, versus those that do not.

Rental prices

No concerns it sounds great to have more rentals especially as a student

Parking, schools that are ALREADY over capacity, overpopulation of cats as they seem to be a common pet for suites.

1. Parking and street congestion
2. Noise issues
3. Multiple pet issues


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off Street Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Parking
- Overpopulation in areas not built for large populations (with regards to everything from traffic congestion to enjoyment of neighbourhood parks - more people typically means more litter, graffiti, use of things that contributes to deterioration, etc.)
- Resources to enforce issues that arise

- definition of a suburban area? Valleyview, Barnhartvale and Dallas are some of the largest lots in the city, are they too rural?
- parking, specifically in the downtown core affecting snow removal
Comments (Continued)

- parking on the street
- density - need to look at number of persons the suite is potentially set up for
- utilities & services - ensure adequate utilities capacity - water, garbage pick-up, etc.

Crowded streets with cars!!
Too many cars,
Street parking

Nick concerns. We need this to grow more sustainably.

As population density increases in neighbourhoods traffic and parking can be an issue, but this is not limited to secondary suites since we see it with new apartment and condo buildings.

Parking the streets can already be a bit crowded. School overcrowding, our school in Juniper is already bursting at the seams. More residents in the area are going to mean expanding the school or building a new one on the other side of Juniper. Lastly rowdy tenants can be a big problem to the peacefulness of the neighbourhoods. Tenants are often less likely to care how loud they are because they aren't committed to stay.

Parking in downtown area

Property that becomes complete rental with no owner living at location. This potentially creates disconnect in the neighbourhood.
Parking, neighbourhoods were created with an understanding how much on street parking would service the houses with in an area. Adding suites can force owners to add extra off street parking for their use, however the on-street parking stays the same and now shared by many additional users.
Not all people want to live in busy neighbourhoods and have chosen areas to live. Shouldn't have to move to areas that don't support suites to accomplish this. Figure out good regulations that satisfies both needs. Maybe limit suites to every other property and leave out cul-de-sac's

Man, this is a poorly worded question...

Off street parking, School densification, traffic.

Parking, noise, parties

1. Your zoning bylaws and the associated requirements (i.e. parking, setbacks, etc) are based on not having suites. You have not required developers to accommodate the increased traffic and parking associated with suites. It turns the neighbourhood into a much pleasant place to be.
2. We paid a premium to be in a new neighbourhood without suites. This was very purposeful on our part due to our very negative experience in Prince George where suites were allowed and it dramatically changed the living quality of the neighbourhood. Furthermore, our neighbourhood is not served by transit so we can expect significantly more traffic and parking issues.

Parking #1
Neighbourhood disputes #2
Neighbourhood congestion #3

1) Parking - many streets already have a great number of parked cars. Would this increase that?
2) Slumlords - would this apply to homes currently being rented? I can see some owners just cramming more people into their rental property

Off street parking for residents and their guests
Neighbourhood congestion creating loss of community feel
Increased traffic

Parking
Fire hazard
Street parking with minimal snow removal limiting access (similar to Drummond crt) which I know already has no off street parking in the winter.
**Comments (Continued)**

1. These places turn into hotels with more people using the place to stay than just the tenant, sometimes as many as four to six people will be staying in a single suite.
2. Parking as many as six vehicles in front of the place or more, some in front of the neighbors is an annoyance.
3. People coming and going at all hours, disturbing the neighbors without suites who are the majority in the neighborhood.

Parking for 2 vehicles off street. If there is a noise? Complaint about the tenants, is landlord responsible or are the tenants responsible.

Parking & increased pressure on services (transit, parks, schools, utilities etc.)

Noise, quality of tenants, and that the process of being approved to have a suite would be prohibitive to owners.

Parking and gravelling of the city boulevard for parking use. Loss of green space such as trees, lawns, shrubs, etc. Increased traffic and noise that accompanies increased density.

Parking, congestion, noise, traffic, transience, crime, increased fire hazards, smoking, pets.
Want more? There are reasons we chose a single family neighbourhood!!

Parking, crime, not my problem you over spent and bought more than you can afford not mortgage helper

Parking
Traffic
Water pressure


-Parking availability around a home with a suite. What can neighbouring homeowners do if this becomes an issue?
2) Neighbourhood noise levels with increased density.

Traffic
Noise
Congestion, overcrowding

Parking, noise, pets

Parking is only concern

Parking

Difficult and long process of eviction
Parking
Quality/transient population

Parking but then that can be addressed in each individual case. I think secondary suites are critical to address the unhealthy illegal suites students are living in.

1) Noise
2) Parking
3) Impact of the make-up and feeling of the neighbourhood

Parking
Noise
Absent Landlords

I have no concerns about this

I have no concerns.
Comments (Continued)

None, I like the ideas of opening the entire city up to help new young families get their foot in the door and be able to use the rental income to purchase new houses and bring even more people to Kamloops

Parking

Parking
Increased unsightly neighbourhoods
Front yards turning into parking lots which decreases vegetation such as trees within the subdivision

Parking - should have to have ample on property parking and not street parking in residential areas
Water meters -should have to have their own meters and or utilities billed or the double billing for the primary residence
Property crime - more rentals means more people and more crime to areas

Suites should be permitted
Ease up on your regulations and grandfather in existing suites

Cleanliness, maintenance, sustainability

None I think it is a great way to prevent urban sprawl and assist home owners with the cost of living in the city.

Parking
Traffic
Noise

1. City process for permit approvals
2. Fees involved for being approved
3. Increased city utility bill structure.

Parking, Adhering to building codes, Capability of City utilities to handle the load

Congestion, quantity of vehicles parked on street and roads. Brock roads are in bad shape and in my opinion, can’t handle the increase in traffic.

No concerns. It makes perfect sense to allow the thoughtful construction of additional accommodation on city lots. Unfortunately, the sheer number and scope of City building bylaws that a person is required to work within make it largely impractical for home owners to do so. As a result, most people will continue to construct suites illegally (without permits).

We are on septic and we need to be on sewer to facilitate suites. A simple bridge would allow us to run a pipe over to the sewer line in Westsyde. This would allow a multitude of suites and new houses to be developed easily instead of having to blast out rock up in the hills.

- ensuring compliance with building codes
- ensuring the safety of the tenant
- ensuring that increased regulation by the City leads to more, rather than less, legal suites

Parking issues, decrease in residential property values for the neighbourhoods if too many secondary suites allowed, loss of neighbourhood character

Street parking vs driveway
Respecting bylaws in place
Common sense factor

parking,

- that parking is made available on property for vehicles of secondary suites, garden suites and carriage houses

My most concern would be parking. There are already probably 10 illegal suites on our street but they are required to park off street from Nov 1st to Mar 30th for snowplowing issues. That in no way concerns me. in our area people seem to do what they want, and so long as they pay for water and park in driveways that’s fine with me
**Comments (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>drugs--traffic--destroy neighbourhood--noise--no parking--speed--garbage--I'm a 50 years resident of Kamloops--and I know this city very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My only concern would be parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parking garbage affordability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking on the street causing congestion for travel, schools not having enough space for potential increases in enrollment, reduced property values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Ensuring suites are being built to code and fire and other hazards are dealt with appropriately.  
2. Parking and over crowded streets.  
3. The city charging large amounts to families who want to build a suite or secondary living space, such as a carriage house or a garage. |

| Street parking.  
Increase in traffic through my neighborhood even if 30 houses in my area added suites that is a lot more cars driving around.  
Most schools are already over capacity (portables). Have additional suites would put extra strain on the schools. |
|---|
| Parking Noise  
Crime if the owner doesn't take precautions to ensure the tenant is not a criminal or addict |

| Infrastructure not ready to handle the increased population.  
An allocated parking spot needs to be on the rental property.  
Noise, overcrowding. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 parking  
2 increased demand on services  
3 noise and traffic on narrow streets |

| 1) New landlords who don't know the legalities of renting, and this could take advantage of renters and vice versa.  
2) Unsafe suites. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parking, crime, rental prices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Concerns.... Parking I know is an issue when rezoning. Everyone drives. And on some streets it’s hard to even park on. maybe an application to use boulevard your responsible for taking care of for personal parking pay tax on it yearly. (have zero idea how that would work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| That it becomes like greater Vancouver. Everyone has a suite, house prices continue to go up because houses have to be bigger and bigger to fit more people in the house to pay mortgages. Stop building monster houses  
Parking |
|---|
| Carriage houses being allowed  
Opposition to suites  
Concerns regarding parking |
Comments (Continued)

Safety - ensuring that they meet code.
Parking - ensuring there is enough width for snow and vehicles on the street.
Taxes - fair distributions of taxes based on multiple family occupied dwellings.

1. The availability of ‘legal’ suites in low, so my concern is that there isn’t a sufficient amount, or that suites don’t seem to be required to meet a standard.

Cars parked on the road in front of my driveway. Lazy people not putting garbage cans away

The tenants paying their rent
The tenants not destroying a suite.

Parking,
Infrastructure overload, and houses that are already a problem becoming a bigger problem (ie-two bad families / tenants in one home, vs just one, for the neighbours to deal with)

Parking
Congestion

Increased number of citizens with lacking health care and education systems. They both are bulging at the seams and no money is going into these areas, what they the new residents bring in in income will not provide enough tax paying dollars to solve our current health care and education needs.

I have none at this time.

Lack of parking in suiteholders driveway.
More traffic for quiet streets.
Lack of parking in front of my own home for my guests.

Parking, noise, lot size/space

Parking; densification that exceeds a neighborhood; more dogs
Parking
Horrendous water pressure
Busy streets
Parking and increased traffic.
Impact of more vehicles on the street
Parking
Noise

On Street Parking.
Increased population densities with limited exit routes out of neighborhoods.
Potential increase of pot smokers and pot smells in neighborhoods.

Safety regulation
Rent control

Street parking and lane access.
Snow removal/street sweeping impacted by increased street parking.
Garbage/recycling pickups.

love it do it now please

Parking
School overcrowding

Parking

Emergency services access

Parking, noise, trespassing of animals and humans

Parking. My ONLY concern would be a requirement that insists on enough parking space to accommodate tenants.
Comments (Continued)

Parking (on Street)
Over densification
Skirting codes and regulations

-difficultly in turning our suit into a legal suit
-parking

Off-street parking for tenants: that they be required and provided.
That’s it!

-more noise/population/people (renters) in my quiet neighbourhood
-rental rates will likely go higher if there is more competition for rentals
-my home might be less desirable for resale if there are renters and laneway units all around us

Parking
Parking
Crime

Parking/Street Use
Crime
Congestion in neighbourhoods

Access to the suite (where the entrance is located). Off-street parking. Fire code.

I don’t think this is fair to home owners who choose to, or want to, live in neighbourhoods without secondary suites.
Lack of parking and lack of visitor parking for homeowners who pay their taxes and invested in a home in a neighbourhood that originally didn’t have high levels of densification
Renters typically show less respect for their neighbours compared to home owners. I see increased complaints to bylaws and rcmp. Speaking from experience with living next to suites in the past.

Parking
Traffic congestion
Noise

- Parking
- Too many people in units
- Property maintenance unkept

1. Parking
2. Safety and maintenance of the Suite
3. Character of the Landlord(s)

Would like to see a limit on the total number of dogs and cats allowed in a residence with a suite.

Drug usage
Upkeep of the property
Noise

Parking parking parking

Parking
Garbage
Safety

traffic, parking, property values

Off Street parking
On Street vehicle parking permit
Comments (Continued)

We bought into Pineview Valley in the beginning and we live on Ash Wynd and the roads are EXTREMELY narrow. It is ALREADY a standing parking lot without LEGAL suites and plow trucks garbage trucks and spring sweeping trucks can't get by right now and you want MORE cars? If secondary suites are allowed home owners that don't want a wall to wall cars in front of their homes cause heaven forbid said owners want their company to be able to park in front of their home not 4 blocks down. If city permits secondary suites homeowner should be able 2 pave another pad in their driveway or meters should be installed as we only want company parking out front of house. City and landlords should supply parking 4 said tenants away from the residence.

None

None

No concerns.

None

1. City of Kamloops regulation changes or unreasonable restrictions given the size of the investment to buy/build suites. These are long term investments with high capital investments by owners.
2. The previous restrictions for legal suites (fire code, separate electrical panels, barriers between floors, etc.) were too restrictive and have resulted very few applications/approvals and an overall decrease in the quality of suites available in the city. My concern is in the city’s ability to work with businesses (it is normally a business) of rental suites in the development of reasonable policies that are maintained over a long period of time. Having some of the very few legal suites in Kamloops, I can attest to the current policies being way too restrictive. (For example one basement suite cost almost $50K to renovate to the city standards - at $1000 month we will be more than 4 years just to repay the reno costs. The suite could have been safe and operable for less than half of that amount).
It is interesting to note that ALL of our houses/suites are beautifully maintained, well built, completely safe, do NOT have parking issues and working extremely well for great tenants, but none would be approved for a legal suite under the current policy - I would even worry that if the city came into any of the suites they have approved in the past that they would rescind the previous approval! (It has happened to other landlords)
3. My primary concern is trusting the relationship with the city and their housing policies. I am optimistic that the City of Kamloops new policy on secondary suites can help eliminate some of the bad and/or unsafe suites we currently see in the city. (FYI - the worse landlords and suites I see are usually the homeowners with a secondary suite not the rental property business owner) An investment in a rental property has huge risk and is often difficult to manage - I have literally risked my family’s future on real estate investments. To engage with the City of Kamloops on any new suite that I would purchase and operate in Kamloops, I would need to be very confident that their new policies are fair and consistent. I believe we are the type of landlord you want operating in your city (our goals are aligned in safe, affordable, quality housing), but there would need to be a large change in how the approval of suites is administered before you receive the level of engagement your looking for in this area.

Parking

I have no concerns. This is a great idea!
## Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back alley usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking, snow removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase demand on aging utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacking up rents to benefit owners with no real improvement to affordable housing crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, Traffic, Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On street parking. Parking should be on the property not the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual appearance, it should still look like a family neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, School overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate off street parking needs to be part of the plan (not just allowing parking on the front lawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsightly storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking - if homeowners have secondary suites, they should have to provide off-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Parking, noise disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased street traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decreased property care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking is my primary concern. Especially at higher elevations in Kamloops, off street parking is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, snow removal, higher than anticipated density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, increase in traffic to cul-de-sacs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample off street parking as streets become narrow and snow clearing is hampered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high of rent in many cases paying there mortgage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable housing for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet friendly many seniors only companion.. they have on many days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of bringing existing suite into compliance, parking, tenancy act makes it hard to give notice to existing renters to do the construction to meet compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trashy people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsightly properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and increased vehicle traffic. Lack of traffic calming, sidewalks and controlled crossings in the downtown and Sagebrush areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking, number of people living in one suite, number of animals allowed in a suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. minimizing the bureaucracy required to legalize the existing suites that are suitably constructed and provide safe affordable housing in the existing market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. realistic parking requirements that match the suite/home to the situation. i.e. one bedroom suite requires 1 off street parking place. Also acceptable to partially stack vehicles i.e. 3 cars in double driveway. Finally accept on street parking in situations where it is safe and enough room to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I support the idea of responsible in-fill in most neighbourhoods with single family housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, over populated street, tenancy laws aren't always in favour of the landlord and can make it difficult to evict problem tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Ensuring the suites meet code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Impact on infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, taxes, transit accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, parking and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some cases, parking would be an issue, but this is primary in homes built in cul-de-sacs. I see no issue as long as you are not renting a 1 bedroom suite to say 4 - 5 people. This can be determined by the home owner using basic common sense. And as well, having communication in regards to owners’ rights as well as tenants. Owners of their own homes that provide secondary suites, or carriage suites should have the right to evict their tenants with notice, which is a right that tenants have now, but it currently could be abused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise from renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on property so that tenants are not parking on street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Garbage piling up (bear attractant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking stress on infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troublesome renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking, too many vehicles parked on street - leading to parking zoning and other barriers to being able to freely park around homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments (Continued)

No real concerns - having suites help everyone, from renters to owners to help with mortgage etc. However, if I had to choose something, I would say parking might be a problem - if a suite needs parking, it should be up to the home owner to supply that parking and not have renters park in front of other homes that may use space for their own family. Outside of that, I am all for suites in residential area.

Street parking and infrastructure

Parking
Additional traffic
Utilities capacity

Parking, noise, too many people in an area resulting in conflict either within the home, or between neighbours.
Q4: Urban neighbourhoods comprise approximately 93% of the city’s population and include Aberdeen, Batchelor Heights, Brocklehurst, Campbell Creek, Dallas, Downtown, Dufferin, Juniper Ridge, Lower Sahali, North Kamloops, Pineview, Sagebrush, Upper Sahali, Valleyview, West End, and Westsyde. Should secondary suites be allowed as a permitted use on lots with single-family dwellings in all Urban neighbourhoods?

10.7%  
No, secondary suites should only be allowed in the following areas (94 of 882)

18.6%  
No, secondary suites should not be allowed in any additional areas (164 of 882)

70.7%  
Yes, secondary suites should be allowed as a permitted use on lots with single-family dwelling Urban neighbourhoods (624 of 882)

No, secondary suites should only be allowed in the following areas:
- Brocklehurst, Campbell Creek, North Kamloops, Valleyview.
- I am fine with a secondary suite on any lot in the city as long as there is proper parking
- Areas that have enough street or driveway parking so the roads don’t get congested
- Off-street parking must be in place or could be put in place without disrupting the streetscape
- Where parking is available, regardless of what part of town it is in.
- Look at all those urban neighbourhoods and see what does not currently have a mix of dwelling types. Have neighbourhoods zoned for single-family and areas for multi-family/secondary suites.

Yes, secondary suites should be allowed as a permitted use on lots with single-family dwelling Urban neighbourhoods:
- Urban Core only. Suites outside Urban Core should go through a rezone process, saying all single family homes is too much density without control for sub-urban areas
- There should be a minimum lot requirement before a suite is approved, too many suites have to use off-property space to park the renters vehicles
- Aberdeen, Batchelor Heights, Brocklehurst, Downtown, Lower Sahali, North Kamloops, Pineview, Sagebrush, Upper Sahali, Valleyview, West End, and Westsyde
- Where there is sufficient parking and roadways to be able to handle the increase in use. Also consider schools
- Where there is enough available parking for the increased number of vehicles the suite would bring to the neighbourhood.
- Places where ample parking is available
- Areas with wide residential streets, and/or areas with controlled parking.
- Aberdeen, Dufferin, Juniper, Pineview, Campbell Creek, Upper Sahali, Lower Sahali.
- North Kam, Dallas, Valleyview
- Only in neighbourhoods where the current infrastructure can handle it. This can’t be a simple yes or no.
- Downtown
No, secondary suites should only be allowed in the following areas (continued):

- In urban neighbourhoods that have larger property sizes/street frontage. Neighbourhoods that are already smaller lot sizes should be restricted subject to vehicle limits and with rentals that are within the primary house print already.
- Only where current owners agree, they purchased the land in an area for a reason and paid a price based on that reason. That reason includes zoning.
- Most of the neighbourhoods listed above a suburban - secondary suites should be permitted within core neighbourhoods if sufficient off-street parking is available. Core = North Shore, L Sahali, West End, Down Town, Sagebrush.
- Lower Sahali, College Heights, Downtown
- Areas where suites were PREVIOUSLY planned so that parking was considered and therefore appropriate parking is planned before the suites are built.
- Only where off street parking is available for ALL vehicles of people living at that address.
- How do you count for all the extra parking spaces? Revenue and street wear and tear? One house had 3 suites and 6 large vehicles plus trailers! ALL ON STREET - a nightmare for the neighbourhood. It caused bad feelings between neighbours. No fun.
- It shouldn’t be based just on area, the primary residence needs to meet criteria, i.e. be able to provide off street parking. Etc.
- New neighbourhoods where parking areas for suited residences are pre-planned, existing areas where there is sufficient parking on existing lots to accommodate tenants.
- Hidden trails, Dufferin
- Where you can prove off street parking
- Secondary suites should be allowed on lots that can accommodate suites. Zoned properties designed for single family use should be used for single family use.

- Where originally zoned/approved. I bought my house because of the low density, low occurrence of rental suites
- areas that can provide on-site parking
- Residential lots with lane as well as street access for on-site parking
- Areas with enough extra parking and distance from neighbors.
- Only where off street parking is provided and where snow clearing will not be affected
- Batchelor Heights, Campbell Creek, Dallas, Juniper Ridge, Pineview, Valleyview and Westsyde
- Suitable. Designed areas
- Downtown, Lower Sahali, or any areas closer to downtown Kamloops as dwellings closer to the city will be best for students and younger families
- In areas where the owner has proceeded through rezoning and allowed neighbourhood impact statements or support to be unveiled before a final decision is made. Illegal suites are not a problem unless they are poorly operated! Current is not broken
- Apartment buildings
- They have off street parking
- Neighbourhoods, or perhaps more specifically, individual lots where the yards are large enough to manage the additional vehicles and resulting density. Perhaps consider a quota per block, like the TUP process used in Sun Peaks.
- Areas with sufficient parking - with most teenagers in the wealthier neighbourhoods having their own cars, parking is an important consideration. Other than that, all areas should be open to secondary suites if the residents are for it.
- where lots are large enough to have off street parking space
- we are against secondary suites in urban neighbourhoods in its entirety, especially in water metered zones
- Some neighborhoods have small houses and lots and are not suitable to squeeze in suites. Downtown, Sagebrush if that is Pine Street and Dominion etc.
- Only permitted in areas where added parking is in excess
- New homes where this could be a planned addition and parking is planned.
- They should only be allowed based on the approval of immediate neighbors as they would be the most affected.
- There should be ample parking and fit the demographic of the community
- Only in single family homes with adequate additional parking, with suites that have separate entrances and NOT Strata Developments
- only in areas where the neighbors have totally agreed and where problems can be dealt with to neighbourhood satisfaction
- Neighbourhoods that already have commercial apartment rental units that wouldn’t suffer from decrease in character (i.e. Aberdeen, Brock, Lower Sahali, North Kam)
- Those areas which currently allow them. Many people purchase or build in areas which have not permitted them, because that is the type of neighbourhood they wish to live in.
- Downtown, Sahali upper and lower. Any area with narrow streets or bus routes
- In areas that allow people to have off street parking. Snow removal is already an issue in the neighborhoods
- Downtown
- Where there not 50% or more already suited or, pre-existing don’t comply with zoning
- Where there aren’t more than a certain amount of suites in a neighborhood. Streets it blocks should be restricted to a certain number of suites to not over density neighborhoods.
No, secondary suites should only be allowed in the following areas (continued):

- Tranquille road from Holt to the airport. Unless there is off road parking.
- Areas with ample free street parking
- Properties that can provide adequate off-street parking for all occupants
- Areas where there is adequate parking. Certain properties without sufficient road frontage shouldn't be permitted to have suites.
- Downtown
- Aberdeen, Sahali
- Places that are specifically designed to accommodate the extra people and cars.
- Downtown
- Zoned for already. And in downtown, university, and Northills core.
- Yes I believe more suites should be allowed but only in areas with enough room for the extra parking requirements
- In any neighbourhood where the streets are not wide enough to accommodate the extra traffic and parking.
- Areas with bigger lot sizes and street parking
- Focus for now should be in higher density areas with good public transit. Downtown - et al, the Shore, Sahali, Dufferin, and Aberdeen
- Consideration should be given to areas where vehicles are not req'd; Dallas, for example, is hard to get to by bus and public transport. Therefore, most if not all residents own cars which contribute to congestion and environmental contaminant.
- Areas with lot sizes that accommodate the additional vehicles and where transit is readily available. Parking is the biggest issue for me.
- I like the idea of allowing suites on properties with alley access and those close to the university.

- Aberdeen, North Shore, Brock, Sahali, downtown.... densify those areas first where there is infrastructure for it (bus routes, shopping, schools, TRU)
- they should be allowed where traffic flow won't become unbearable and where there is ample parking
- I think areas that are close to RT zoning. Like Columbia Street where one side suites are permitted and the other side they are not. I don't think they should be in areas that are strictly RS-1 zoning
- Only areas with sufficient parking i.e. no cul de sacs
- Anywhere but downtown, parking is already a nightmare on residential streets
- I don’t think this can be a blanket yes or no. We are probably best to have a variety of suites and not on each block.
- Downtown, Sahali, North Kamloops. The more densely populated and central to commercial areas.
- Properties that are large enough... i.e. A large lot on Valleyview Dr. versus a tight yard which can barely squeeze another housing unit/extra parking
- I think each neighbourhood you listed should have designated sub areas that allow suites and enforce non-compliance outside of those areas. This satisfies both homeowners who want suites in their neighbourhood and those that choose not to
- Where parking accommodates (not in cul de sacs),
- Where the lots are simply too small to accommodate the extra parking and storage requirements
- Only at lower elevations or where off street parking is available, unless snow is better managed.
- Areas that can manage the additional traffic
- Where you have sufficient off road parking available. Otherwise there is street congestion, especially in the winter months when piles of snow plus street parking reduce traffic to single lanes.
Q5: Garden suites (one-storey accessory residential dwellings) and carriage suites (two-storey accessory residential dwellings) are only permitted on lots with single-family dwellings in the RS-1S (single-family residential - suite) zone. The City is considering allowing garden suites as a permitted use in more urban residential areas. Carriage suites will continue to require a rezoning process. If garden suites are permitted on lots with single-family dwellings in more urban neighbourhoods, in which additional areas should they be allowed?

17.7% Urban Core only - Downtown, West End, Sagebrush, and North Kamloops (158 of 895)
6.8% Other (61 of 895)
17.5% No additional areas (157 of 895)
58.0% All Urban neighbourhoods (519 of 895)

**Other, please specify:**
- As long as there is sufficient space on the property, proper access to the suite with parking then it can be on any lot across the city as far as I am concerned.
- Should not require rezoning; should be permitted up to two family density, zones, particularly in suburban and rural, with criteria to meet (minimum greenspace, parking if no street parking, review of built form, no loss of established trees)
- Parcels greater than 650m², within parcel coverage parameters and meet parking requirements
- Again view each urban area to ensure a variety of zoning in a neighbourhood. For those wanting to buy single-family zoned houses they have that choice, for others wanting garden suites or secondary suites have some areas zoned for specific areas.
- only on large properties where space and parking are ample
- In all areas but must consider density of area already. Parking availability and noise potential with additional people in neighbourhood. I live where I live because it is quiet.
- Only as part of existing garages/outbuildings
- Only where appropriate parking spots have been provided for the suite
- I see Barnhartvale is omitted!!!
- None in the older parts of town (i.e. north kamloops, brock, west end downtown)
- Again, this can’t be a simple yes for that neighbourhood, and no for another. I believe this would need to be decided on the state of each neighbourhood at the time of the application.
- restricted number of sec suites per block (first come first served. some garden and NO CARRIAGE)
- Where lot sizes achieve certain minimums
- Continue to require rezoning application and development permit process for garden suites and carriage suites, consider on site by site basis.
- Anywhere city infrastructure (water, sewer etc.) can support them as well as OFF street parking.
- Any residence that can accommodate a building space wise (not intruding on neighbours), and allows off street parking
- Be limited by lot size
- If lots are big enough to provide off street parking, then this could happen
- Residential lots with lane as well as street access for on-site parking
- Minimum lot size and off-street parking
- should be reviewed on a case by case basis
- Designed areas
Other, please specify (continued):

- All zones subject to rezoning
- Include all areas within the city limits
- Perhaps properties that are larger - 1+ areas.
- Areas with large lots, example, Barnhartvale.
- Not so much dependent on area of city but on lot size. Lot needs to be sufficiently big to accommodate a garden suite
- On properties of a certain minimum area. With adequate access and parking off street.
- Only where the lot area lost to the garden suite doesn't boost the floor space ratio above a determined number (don't ask me what that number is!!).
- Only lots large enough to accommodate the additional suite without cramming the suite in to the lot should be permitted. As it is most newer construction already have small lots (i.e.-Pineview) that do not lend themselves to this type of construction.
- I live in Barnhartvale (on Todd Road, closer to highway and more residential area). We would love to have a garden suite to rent long term or for family, but are excluded from the urban list, even though we are minutes from Dallas & Campbell Creek.
  - based on minimum lot size
  - They should be allowed on lots large enough to still have room for landscaping. Landscaping has very many beneficial effects and those beneficial effects cannot be understated.
  - I wouldn’t narrow it to a certain part of town but to places with enough room on their lot to house a garden or carriage suite.
  - Only on lots with lots of acreage or space so buildings are not crunched together.
  - Any, provided you deal with parking first.

- Properties with larger lot sizes
- All urban areas, providing that their lot is large enough and there is enough parking.
- Urban core and any other area with suitable lot size and minimal excavation requirements.
- Home owners living in cul-de-sacs should not be permitted to allow secondary suites due to parking issues.
- Based on lot size
- Garden and carriage suites are separate places from the residence itself. Therefore, if it is there or if there is proper space, I don't see a reason it cannot be allowed anywhere.
- Must have sufficient off street parking, and sufficient green space for each home to avoid feeling crammed in, thus leading to possible conflict.
Q6: Based on your level of agreement, please rank each of the following statements about suites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suites provide an affordable housing option for renters</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites add to the total stock of rental housing in the city</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites provide a mortgage helper and source of income for homeowners</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites allow families to stay together by providing accommodation for children attending university or for aging family members</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites create parking issues in neighbourhoods</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suites negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive infill through the development of suites is good for residential neighbourhoods</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q7: Please share any other comments you have about suites below.

Comments

Good for the community as long as they are managed accordingly. Increased bylaw enforcement and permitting should coincide with any increase in suites in outlying urban neighborhoods.

The city needs to address the taxation issue of homes currently with illegal suites, this is the reason schools are underfunded... neighborhoods have more children living in these houses that are taxed as single family occupancy, the same goes for solid waste collection and sewage. There needs to be serious thought given to the fire protection and separation in homes with illegal suites, these houses were never built or designed as dual occupancy dwellings and may not allow for proper egress during an emergency and lack proper fire separation between units.

Having lived in a neighbourhood that allowed suites (Mission, B.C.), I have seen firsthand how destructive tenants can be. What was once a really nice neighbourhood turned into a neighbourhood with lots of crime, vehicles crammed everywhere, garbage strewn about on the street. It was sad. So we moved to Aberdeen (Kamloops, B.C.) I think there’s only 3 residences in our area (Glenmohr Estates) that have tenants. Only 1 tenant seems to be a problem (extremely noisy car - maybe with no muffler) and the other 2 seem fine.

The suites in this neighborhood seem to attract university students and low paid workers or non-working people. The occupants of these units change on a regular basis and some regularly do not respect noise bylaws, parking or property. They are not neighborly people in my experience.

Suites are a good idea. Hopefully if they are legalized there will be more available. I am looking at purchasing a home and have seen a number of suites in homes that are poorly built, and might not meet building standards. It would be nice if we were able to ensure suites are built to code.

Tax incentive to renovate existing to Code standards may help legalize. Rural and suburban properties that are serviced need suites to pay for infrastructure investment.

Off-street parking is critical. Or a covenant/agreement that any renter will not have a vehicle. If through the TDM study (concurrent to this one) we want more alternate modalities such as biking to work then WE CANNOT clog the streets with more vehicles through on-street parking.

I support suites in all neighborhoods, but I strongly believe it needs to be monitored. My main concern is the legality of sketchy renovations for a homeowner to make money.

I believe mandating every single-family dwelling to allow for multi-family/secondary suites is wrong and I appreciate the opportunity to have a survey for feedback. I agree with offering a zoning choice of neighborhood variety so if citizens what only a single-family dwelling they have that choice. It is incredible frustrating when you love your neighborhood location and frequent illegal suites are continually problematic from safety, drug trafficking, safety, parking and other issues. Thank you.

Any new suites if allowed need to go through the appropriate re-zoning process.
Any new suites if allowed need to be constructed as per all current BC Building Codes.
Any new suites if allowed need to pay DCC’s or fees equal to those charged to currently zoned and approved suites.

I am proud to own my home on the North Shore and would love to add to the housing stock by constructing a garden suite, but the process is currently too cumbersome and expensive. I believe permitting more secondary suites across Kamloops would be a win-win for property owners and renters and I strongly support this direction.
Comments (Continued)

I would like to feel convinced that all the additional properties are billed accordingly and water use captured by the water meter, water meter pits should be required on all properties with a suite.

If we didn’t have a suite for my mother to live in and pay a very minimal amount, she would be essentially homeless, even though she works full time. Before we bought our current home, we rented for 6 months. In Andersen we had a two bedroom top floor of a house and paid 1850 plus utilities every month. Rental prices in this city are out of control because there is a limited number of legal suites.

Parking is never considered as we found out renting an apartment. Where there is no public parking and a big problem when family comes to visit for more than 2 hours?? CAN NOT BELIEVE THE CITY APPROVED A PERMIT TO ALLOW A SITUATION LIKE THIS FOR SUCH A LARGE APARTMENT BUILDING AND NO PARKING?!

Parking issues could be dealt with by requiring registration of vehicles allowed to park on the street in front of private property. Other vehicles would require space on the property, or would either not own a vehicle or make arrangements for parking off site.

The area that I live in has suites that were not approved, put in after the fact. I think that people will still put in suites approved or not. There are also single family homes that have more than one suite. Parking has become a problem. Parking should not have to be supplied by the City but the landlord before approval is given.

It is difficult to fill out the survey without a map showing where the RS-1S zones are. How do you expect someone to make an informed decision without more information?

There should be a limit on the number of suites in a given area otherwise the street parking will be a real problem for the other home owners and that is very unfair.

In older neighbourhoods such as downtown and North Shore, suites should be reviewed thoroughly in order to maintain the character of the neighbourhood, the available parking, and the age of the infrastructure.

Again I strongly oppose suites in, and I emphasize this term, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS!!! Enough said.

A mechanism to ensure existing suites are safe and don’t create a liability issue for the community.

I don’t think every house should be allowed a suite, required permitting can play a role in watching overdensification. I can only imagine the chaos on some streets if 80% of the house have suites.

You should encourage people with illegal suites to come forward and have it inspected to see if it’s close to code. Although I don’t think if a suite has been on the books with the city utilities and taxes you could ask too much about bringing it up to current building code. Only if it was deemed uninhabitable then I think that’s a problem the RTO should also deal with. I know most people wouldn’t volunteer but maybe some would be interested in the get out of jail free card if some repairs weren’t mandatory they were just strongly suggested.

- the densification of Kamloops will lead to better bus service, which will mean more people can live without a vehicle and address the parking issue.
- As a taxpayer, paying for new infrastructure PLUS upgrading aging infrastructure is causing us to pay higher taxes. I would rather upgrade the aging infrastructure and create density, instead of sprawl.

More pros than cons
Comments (Continued)

I would feel more comfortable filling out this survey if I had an idea of what the building by-laws require of secondary suites (as to quality and utilities implemented) because my BIG concern is that if wholesale suite/carriage house/etc. development is permitted city-wide, how does the City see the social fabric of the neighbourhoods affected if ‘anything’ goes--are there restrictions on how many people can inhabit a secondary suite, is there corresponding green space available for increased population density, etc.

I think the issue here is that there are so many suites already existing. (Almost all illegal and few up to code). What will be done to address this?

Increased garbage, recycling, water etc should be billed accordingly to those that have suites as well as a parking spot on the property should be considered. For example I would not want neighbours tenants parking in front of my house all the time.

These suites do not provide secure housing. You may THINK they provide affordable housing options, but if they’re not secure, they’re more problem than help over the long term. House suites only SEEM to add to available stock. What it ACTUALLY does is prevent developers from building proper rental housing blocks because they can’t compete. You’re actually TAKING AWAY INCENTIVE to build more of the housing you SAY you want, and you’re creating many, many new problems in the meantime. Suites MAY provide some assistance to mortgages - but it comes at much greater cost and risk. They have to make sure they have the right insurance or THEY’RE NOT COVERED! They could lose EVERYTHING. Risk of fire and other loss increases dramatically. There are tax implications not only on the income they get, but on the capital gains aspect of their home. YOU CHARGE MORE FOR CITY TAXES - but not as much as you should. By stressing all this more money and mortgage assistance and making more housing available propaganda YOU are part of the unethical shysters promoting people taking risk at their expense to SOLVE YOUR BAD MANAGEMENT problems.

Please let this happen. Let’s move forward ASAP

Not fair to homeowners who don’t want to have an influx of revolving tenants next door as many tenants cause more disruption with noise and parking.

As stated above, the addition of suites will not lower prices. They’re bad enough as it is. Put more effort into

I hope affordability is made better by having more suites to rent. The costs for most currently are unattainable for some lower or fixed income people.

We definitely need more suites in Kamloops and a good variety of options along with processes that aren’t cumbersome make it easier for homeowners to provide suites.

Collect fees for all suites, and follow the same complaint driven by-laws on unsafe suites

Please allow suites and carriage houses etc. in all areas, without making homeowners go through the awful rezoning application/public hearing process. It is time for Kamloops to be a real City with a decent Performing Arts Centre and increased urban density in all parts of town. If you do not allow more suites etc. you are encouraging the continuation of a patchwork of suburban sprawl which is ugly, and bad for the environment. Allowing suites contributes to a sense of community and helps the environment! As we densify we have more local services. Coffee shops etc. that people walk to instead of driving to spring up in neighbourhoods. Young families need the mortgage help from suites. Tenants need rental accommodation. Multi-generational families need the extra living space. It is time to stop living in the 1950s and start living in the 21st century.

Density makes all city services from transit to fire to garbage collection all more economical and self-sustaining.
Comments (Continued)

It was hard for us to find a house to purchase downtown without a suite. I miss big yards, trees & gardens, and simple single-family dwellings. Is there a way to preserve space & nature while allowing some rental suites? Some rentals are more run-down than owner inhabited homes. Is there a way to prevent that?

I feel a lot of the housing that has been provided is for people with mental health issues, drug issues or crime types of people. Most people without those issues don’t want to move to the new housing and some are even scared too. Low income housing is important but so is a safe place and reasonable housing and I believe by allowing suites that seniors, disabled people and the low income working people will be able to find better neighborhoods and housing for themselves. I also believe that the more suites available the more reasonable rent will become.

Affordable housing is needed not overpriced suites where the landlord/homeowner collects rent and does not claim the extra income to Revenue Canada. If you want to rent a suite or room, then you should be required to pay additional costs for schools, taxes, utilities etc. EVERYONE should be contributing to the community and the City needs to find a way to ensure this happens. Time to stop burying heads in the sand and figure out a solution.

If we allow anyone to have suites they may prove to be unsafe for people living in them.

Renting of a suite should not be advocated as a source of income for people as there is not sufficient protection to landlords who have derelict, troublesome tenants. I have knowledge of several people who have experienced major problems renting their suites, and have suffered dire financial consequences. Kamloops should focus on getting a multi floor rental unit built where the landlord has the experience and resources to deal with tenant problems.

Though I experience the frustrations of parking and a neighborhood that has lost its beauty from rentals, I 100% support these suites as they are crucial to the development of neighbourhoods and will ultimately bring in more people to grow the Kamloops economy. If there is an active landlord, then there really should be no problem. Unfortunately this is not the case with some rentals on my block.

I would rather see more multi-storey developments approved rather than more in-fill, basement suites cause a lot of social issues that get brushed aside by the city.

Traffic and parking congestion needs to be considered and addressed. Building permits and parameters need to be appropriate to neighbourhood design and character, and safety and quiet enjoyment of all residents.

Expanding infrastructure is more costly than infill. Many fail to recognize the full life cycle cost of an asset.

Parking is on a case-by-case basis. Putting suites in every house in a small (keyhole) crescent is one matter. Having then on a regular residential street is likely less of a problem. Studio suites will likely have no or maybe one car. If it’s a two-bedroom suite, current parking needs to be assessed as to impact of 1-2 vehicles associated with a suite of that size.

The parking issue needs to be address - no additional vehicles should be parked on the street.

I understand the need for more affordable housing in Kamloops, however, like anything there are home owners who take advantage of the opportunity and everyone in the neighbourhood suffers, and then what is done to control this... usually not much.
Comments (Continued)

Parking is my number one concern. Cars on city streets are already a safety problem - they park too close to driveways and intersections meaning drivers have to pull way out to see if anything is coming. This also means pedestrians are stepping onto roads between parked cars - a dangerous situation. Permits for suites should only be allowed where parking onsite is available.

I am against a whole house being rentable, i.e. renters upstairs and downstairs, they are not considerate to their neighbours and don’t care for their property, as well as not caring for neighbours property. I am also against suites big enough for families to rent, renting to 1-2 single people is okay because it will not affect noise and parking as much.

Wording on that last question is really bad

More housing is needed throughout Kamloops and area...low income rent...can help...can make a difference...as well can increase all benefits throughout any part of Kamloops and area

I feel secondary suites are 100% necessary for young people to be able to afford housing in this economy. Inflation, the cost of living, and the price of houses are increasing much more rapidly than wages, which is drastically reducing the capacity for people to purchase housing and pay for the mortgage. In addition, the vacancy rate is so low that rental fees are artificially inflated from the lack of supply. The only way to fix this supply is by increasing the incentive (or decreasing the barrier to entry) of having a suite.

The City should also consider legalizing suites for half-duplex. Many neighborhoods in Sahali have half-duplexes that have much more parking capacity (both driveway and on street) than houses downtown. In addition, half-duplex often provide the most affordable entry to the market for first time home buyers which are very motivated to create suites by virtue of having generally lower disposable income than individuals further in their career.

would love to talk to someone other than Planning Dept that would consider our case

they are so needed

I truly hope the city will ensure any changes are spread fairly throughout the city and will not play favourites with the higher class neighbourhoods.

If no concerns from neighbours or community, then existing non-conforming suites should be grandfathered in. No permits, no zoning requirement changes. Stay out of my business.

How did you come up with the minimum lot area of 464m2? Seems arbitrary to me, I think that number should be lowered. In reality more than 4 families could live on that much space. We are only talking about the family upstairs, and a 1/2 bedroom suite below...that number needs to be reduced in order to be based in reality.

How did you come up with minimum street frontage of 15m? Seems arbitrary to me, I think that number should be lowered. All you need is enough room for a vehicle to park on the street in front of your own property. The average sedan is 4m long, according to your standards we must have enough room for 3+ vehicles??? That’s insane, lower that number please.

Has the new city plan been completed so that red zone and yellow zone areas have been redefined?

I am against secondary suites on my street because there are no sidewalks which cause renters to park car on part of my property. I have built a secondary parking on my property and some renters think it’s perfect for them to use it. I do manage to catch some and explain they are parking in my front yard.

The major problem with suites is the stupid rentals man/women. Many of us have experienced very inconsiderate tenants and evicting same is next to impossible with the rentals man/women being one of the major stumbling blocks. The rentals man/women is always on the side of the tenant. With this attitude people do not like to rent.
**Comments (Continued)**

No other comments

Parking & # of residents in home/suite.

Maintain setbacks for new construction

With a growing city and increased intentional students, it would be better to increase the number of suites. I have heard of international students living in motels as they cannot find any alternatives. I have also heard of people trying to cram as many people in their rental units. If we had more secondary suites, this could be avoided. Furthermore, homes are becoming increasingly unaffordable (increase in price of homes, tougher mortgage rules). As a result, more people will have to rent and they will have to rent for a longer period before they can buy their own.

There are too many rental suites that are problem houses and I live by a house that has had many different issues, including grow op, abandoned, squatters, renters who are different every year and have serious issues that affect the people around them. Latest being known to police for having a mental health related homicide in the past.

Suites help distribute income through the middle class. They allow the average home owner to make rental income instead of it going to large corporations owning apartment complexes.

Of my friends that own houses, roughly 50% of the people I know have suites in them. None of them have caused any neighbourhood problems.

The neighbourhood I live in already has a significant parking problem, as a result of illegal suites and rented rooms. I don't feel that a blanket statement of yes or no is appropriate for any neighbourhood without first addressing the needs & issues each area is currently facing.

The sooner the City of Kamloops gets on board with allowing rental suites in urban areas, the sooner stricter building enforcements can start to keep everyone safe such as ensuring fire walls are created between the primary residence and secondary suite.

I generally agree with allowing home-owners to have secondary suites, but I think that there should be some way to limit on-street parking for tenants (i.e. you can have a suite but you must be able to provide parking on your lot for tenants, or perhaps limit to one car? I'm not sure how enforceable this is - but this is my only concern).

Noise
Drugs
Parking
Garbage
Over crowding

Absolutely no to Carriage homes - they are too imposing on neighbours. Secondary suites can serve a purpose if well managed and enforced by City. I've owned 2 homes in Kamloops and in both cases, I've been negatively impacted by greedy and disrespectful neighbours who have cheated the system in putting in suites and in both cases, I've had to 'fight' with the neighbour and city - DON'T WANT TO GO THROUGH THIS ANYMORE.

I feel that if there isn't enough parking to accommodate the extra people it has the appeal to decrease the appeal of a neighbourhood.

Urban Core - we should replace old homes with small multi-family at every opportunity. Secondary suites in new homes. This is how we meet our absolutely necessary carbon goals as laid out by the IPCC.

Other Urban neighbourhoods: Secondary suites and Thirdary suites.

Suburban Neighbourhoods: I would support secondary suites here as well - even though these people will need to drive more and create parking and GHG pollution issues.

It is incorrect to assume that suites are a mortgage helper or create additional income for their owners. In fact, homes with suites have large purchase prices and therefore larger mortgage payments (and more interest), and if retrofitting a suite into an existing home, the cost of construction alone would consume years of rent payments. The proliferation of homes with suites is not something to encourage, as it will create a ‘race to the bottom’ where nearly all homes must include suites to be attainable to the average buyer.
Comments (Continued)

This is a reasonable idea unlike forcing strata councils to remove rental restrictions. This allows for people who want to live with the renters the ability to do so. Suites do not share common areas and recreational areas of apartment buildings. This is a more reasonable approach. The government should not, however, expect private landlords and neighborhoods to deal with issues like drug and alcohol dependence, mental illness and homelessness. These problems require funding and staff to help clean the units and neighborhood, and supervise people who have problems. Changes to the residential tenancy act need to be made to support landlords who are dealing with nightmare people.

The City *MUST* create bylaws to put the onus of upkeep, noise level and parking and respectful treatment of neighbours ON THE TENANTS / occupants NOT ON THE LANDLORDS! Please re-read what I wrote as number two concern in question 3. Then please go back and re-read again (three more times). The onus MUST BE PLACED ON THE TENANT/OCCUPANT and the landlords MUST BE SUPPORTED.

Suites are an excellent part of the solution to our housing crisis. Kids growing up in apartments don’t have the space to play outdoors. Suites help even very low income families have space for their children to play safely.

Allowing suites in all neighbourhoods will give renters more rights and options as to where they live. Suites will be created in a safer way and renters will be able to find more places to live that adhere to health and safety standards instead of being forced to live in illegal suites that do not follow the appropriate safety guidelines and standards.

I am hoping this will show a positive outcome for the rental issues in Kamloops. I also see it as extremely advantageous for young couples starting out or as for us, bringing my Mom in Law into our home but also giving her the independence of a garden suite to call her own. Parking is a huge issue and needs to be addressed pre to allowing the suites - off road parking spot(s) when the lot allows is needed.

I would like to know more clearly the process of getting approvals for a suite or the likelihood of rezoning for a garden or carriage suite. Again, I am looking to buy a property that will allow me to add either of these and in a hot real estate market it is not feasible to take time to determine these answers.

People in the area should first agree to it, Noise and parking need to be taken care of. People who don’t have suites should not have to pay for the additional by-law services to keep noise and parking under control.

80% of my students at TRU suggested that affordable housing was a major barrier (lack of jobs was the number one problem) to studying in Kamloops. When 20% of your clients leave to find better opportunities in Vancouver I can’t help but wonder what the loss of revenue that represents for Kamloops. Thanks for approaching this issue!

There is currently a house across the street from mine where there are at any point in time, 0 - 4 vehicles in the driveway and an addition 3 - 5 on the street. Further the location is used a driver exchange site for a local cab. IMO there needs to be additional restrictions on the number of cars a suite renter can have or there needs to be adequate off street parking to accommodate all residents of the property.
Comments (Continued)

You are assuming suites will be well built to code, from my experience this simply is not reality. Suites are almost always illegal (i.e. not to code). Only new build housing can justify adding suites at reasonable investment cost, and these are often in far flung locations (e.g. Juniper or Aberdeen). A blanket rezoning will encourage people to continue jamming units into basements with mold problems, poor lighting, inadequate fire separation, inadequate electrical systems. Significant health and safety risk.

By increasing supply of suites the city will actively discourage people from correctly building to code as the Return on Investment will no longer be viable. The significant cost to construct a suite is often financed. Rents need to be high enough to cover construction and finance costs (assume $200/sf @ 5% line of credit interest) do the math.

Affordable housing should be provided by the province and federal government, the city’s zoning bylaw is not an appropriate tool for physically providing affordable housing.

City should focus on enforcement of existing zoning regulations - start cracking down on student flop housing, and front yards converted to asphalt for parking with derelict landscapes. Much of Kamloops looks like a garbage dump - it’s embarrassing to bring out-of-town guests.

If the City wants to encourage legal basement suites, simplify the rezoning process - if OCP conditions are met, Council can wave the public hearing, further, the rezoning application fee could be reduced significantly. It’s ridiculous that a RS-1S rezoning application costs the same as a complex multi-family or commercial rezoning application. The rezoning process allows the city to educate applicants up front about the building permit process and some of the complications they should be aware of when considering a suite (e.g. minimum ceiling heights, emergency egress, fire separation, heating requirements, clean air intake requirements, etc).

There is something to be said about pride of ownership. Currently where I live; I own my home but several of my neighbours have tenants in their basements which clogs up the street parking. We have noticed an uptick in people loitering on the street, break ins, etc., Rentals are not cheap; in fact many people pay more for a rental than a mortgage but since demand is so high, people get gauged. There is no one solution but allowing a free for all is not the answer.

Suites only increase purchase price for homes and force people to rent suites. Rentals should be purpose built (new apartment buildings) and not forced into basement suites. I am strongly opposed to basement suites. Increased traffic and parking on my cul de sac has made it unsafe for my kids to play in the cul de sac.

Having a couple suites on a street is ok however allowing every second house to have one makes the neighbourhood overcrowded and junky. With the HIGH taxes we pay to live here with little extras compared to Kelowna we deserve to enjoy our community. It’s bad enough Kamloops is becoming the homeless hub of BC and with all of the free housing the criminals are racing here...we don’t need any more suites! Our crime is ridiculous already.

I believe that urban rezoning to include secondary suites could benefit Kamloops renters by increasing housing supply, but I am concerned that it could produce fewer suites on the market than anticipated, with homeowners foregoing traditional rentals in favor of grey-market short-stay suites (i.e. AirBnB), with a concomitant increase in long-term rental prices as an unintended consequence. Alongside any widespread rezoning, the city must increase existing business licensing enforcement for short-stay suites and restrict the number of dedicated short-stay suites in urban areas.
Comments (Continued)

Housing prices continue to rise in our city and in our province, housing is a crisis. It would be really great for the City to be pro-active instead of reactive, the City can become a leader. It will also support hidden homelessness and contribute positively to affordable housing for everyone. It is a good step to take. Renters are just as responsible as owners, but not everyone has or wants the ability to own. We need to support everyone in our community. By serving as many demographics and socioeconomic groups, our community will thrive. Often you hear parking can be a concern - it would be important to identify a strategy to go along with this if approved. Really make people understand the need and provide a few options, such as if you have a suite, you can get an extra permit for street parking downtown etc... make it attractive and have a proper media campaign to support everyone in our community.

I am all for suites. They will increase taxes for the city without any cost to the city as most houses have illegal suites and all need to be paying their share of the extra sewer, water and garbage as well the value of the house should reflect the extra value so they pay more property taxes. But the main issue I have with suites is the on road parking. If you have a suite, you must have a parking spot off road for it.

It is clearly evident from our experience that under the existing rules, secondary suites in a single-family area already create overload street-parking problems by reason of the city permitting additional in-home rentals, thus increasing the risk of serious injury or worse to younger resident children! Under the current rules many owners and renters already have more than one vehicle which clearly exacerbates these problems. We do not need to add to that problem by encouraging additional renters with vehicles! We are definitely NOT in favour of permitting additional suites!

I would accept secondary suites and garden houses if they were allowed in the same zone. No special zones for one or the other. And no special zones that exclude suites or garden houses in areas of high income, for example. All or nothing to avoids snobs and NIMBYs creating their own havens for one excuse or another.

Other jurisdictions have a published guide outlining the requirements for compliant suites, something Kamloops does not have.

Lack of clarity and disagreement between different building inspectors has created delays, cost overruns and general frustrations attempting to build a legal suite. If Kamloops is encouraging more homeowners to build compliant legal suites, it is IMPERATIVE that there is clarity around the code requirements and it is IMPERATIVE that the building inspectors are properly trained to enforce the codes in a consistent manner. Alternatively, a single inspector should be assigned to each building permit so that disagreements in the inspectors’ application of code does not adversely affect the homeowners.

Rental fees are outrageous, a single person or low income parents struggle to find affordable housing. More rentals and relaxed guidelines would lower rental prices and support people trying to get into the housing market.

I am terribly conflicted as I do believe that suites will change our neighbourhood, but I am also of a generation that needs to consider this option to meet our family’s needs. I expect there are many families in a similar situation to ours. I also think that the rental situation in Kamloops is dire and requires some creative urban planning.

Our street is already overcrowded, our homes are too close together, traffic is already an issue, and it is ruining neighborhoods. Crime will also have a good chance of increasing from temporary renters who will come and go. Illegal suites can be unsafe if they are just DIY suites from the homeowner avoiding paying city permits and doing things properly. I know on my street there are a couple of houses that are being run as commercial businesses as they are being rented to a youth care facility in town. We purchased a home up here for a nice quiet area and that is being ruined.

Suites are good for every resident of Kamloops. Helps with housing affordability for homeowners and renters alike. Parking can be addressed by making transit more affordable and accessible, increasing bike paths and encouraging ride share programs.
Comments (Continued)

You can’t outlaw what people are already largely doing. People need homes and suites are an easy way to double the housing stock and make homes more affordable for owners and renters alike.

Some areas may have more parking space and / or regular bussing services but in areas where houses are built with very narrow lots, parking becomes problematic.

Traffic, congestion, noise, more issues, parking, the list goes on!!

On my street parking from suites has been a horrible problem which has resulted in physical altercations. One incident involved the RCMP being called. The city has done a horrible job enforcing parking bylaws and streets were never designed to accommodate this much overflow parking. It is making it unsafe for kids to ride bikes.

1. Utility fees must be collected from suite owners and property taxes should be adjusted to cover costs associated with managing program.
2. Create an online registering system and consider developing a rating system so that prospective renters / property buyers can assess the area before entering a lease or purchase contracts and for neighbours/tenants an ability to report concerns. Also, an online rating system should be available for landlords to post reviews of current/past tenants, so that other landlords can quickly assess and avoid potential nightmares. These nightmare tenants usually require mental health/addictions/community living supports and should be housed accordingly. It is not the responsibility of private untrained citizens to manage and house this population.
3. Hire more bylaw officers
4. If all levels of government are shifting the responsibility for providing low income housing to the community, prov/fed should help provide funds for landlords and neighbours to pay for the removal of discarded furniture/garbage/broken bicycles when bad tenants leave mess and for cleaning up yards damaged/neglected by tenants who have ZERO money because even court ordered payments do not actually get paid because you cannot get blood from a stone. Most people who buy a house with a suite for a mortgage helper are not rich investors. They are hardworking people who have jobs and families and can not afford to deal with nightmare tenants. Perhaps municipally, those landlords with low community/tenant ratings would have to pay higher registration fees and the extra fees can also partially fund this program and/or pay for extra bylaws officers to reduce negative impacts and help sell this idea to reluctant communities. There should also be prov/fed tax breaks for landlords who end up having to pay for mess/damages from tenants they can’t get court ordered money from. All the education in the world will not matter if there’s resistance because the reality is there are nightmare tenants and slum landlords - so there should be a specific fund for these situations.
5. Design guidelines for types of secondary suites that can really impact neighbour’s property values/views etc. Do not allow duplexes to morph into four-plexes.
6. If the true intent is to increase the stock of affordable housing, then BAN the use of these suites for short term rental purposes.
**Comments (Continued)**

Suites are fine if the landlord does their homework... don’t rent to the first person with the money. Do a thorough check of possible tenants.

Suites should only be permitted in locations where there is adequate parking and the arrangement is such there is not negative impact on neighbors from noise and excess numbers of vehicles. The premise of single family dwellings - is single family. Where is the value in a single family dwelling when it becomes a multi-family dwelling in neighborhoods that were not designed for that type of housing. In the house next to me there are consistently 3 to 4 cars parked where in a shared driveway because of the suite. Just one example.

With so many steep driveways homeowners are already parking on the street, then tenants add to that congestion. Winter is a nightmare as the homeowner nor the tenant in my neighbourhood takes care of personal snow removal (sidewalks etc.)? Garbage bins overflowing in suite properties. Property owners who don’t take care of rental properties. These issues depreciate the value of my home.

Currently there are numerous illegal suites in Kamloops that bylaw turns a blind eye to. Permitted and legally developed suites would probably be acceptable but who is going to police and shutdown all the current illegal suite? With no enforcement the rash of illegal suites will just continue as owners don’t want to outlay the cost to bring the suites up to safe and legal status.

Should allow more suites

I believe the city is on the right track :)

Suites should only be allowed where adequate parking has been pre-planned and/or where the home owner has adequate parking for tenants ON THE RESIDENTIAL LOT. If the suite requires tenant parking on the street, it should not be permitted.

Suites are critical to Kamloops housing and critical to new/young buyers fighting tooth and nail to be able to afford their own home. This is a downright fact of future life with larger populations, increased expenses, decreased affordability, and higher density in urban areas (which contributes to the economy, culture, and health of a city). I am 100% in favor of secondary suites and carriage homes.

I think people should take an active interest in their suite rentals. Clean and cared for, not just thrown together and cheap. Make them livable/enjoyable for people. Parking is a huge issue with illegal suites. I do not think street parking should be used for residential parking or rental parking. Your property should accommodate your vehicles.

It is very challenging to rent a full house in Kamloops. Poorly designed rental suites built to be mortgage helpers or so home owners can earn extra cash are contributing to poor quality of life for tenants in Kamloops. Rental suites are not pleasant places to live. Living above or below a landlord imposes restrictions on lifestyle, habits, noise and storage for the tenants in the home. Suites are often inadequately resourced for the expected rent, lacking laundry, storage, yards, closets or bathtubs. Some have ceilings that aren’t even 7 feet high or layouts that make absolutely no sense.

Living in a home that has two renters and no landlord poses its own set of challenges and stresses to the people who live there. Income properties, homes that people purchase to rent out are contributing to the housing shortage and instability of tenants in Kamloops. Increasing access to suites will only make this problem worse.

As a renter, it’s hard to find a good suite in town. Especially as a young renter/student, there is no knowledge readily available (where students would think to look) discussing the rights of renter’s or the specifications of legal suites. Many students rent illegal suites and don’t even know it. Which means they are often paying out of pocket for a repair because they don’t know any better, or are stuck with inadequate living conditions. If the city allows for more suites, then there will be less reasons for illegal suites, and hopefully will be able to express more information about renting that can get back to the youth, and students of Kamloops.
Comments (Continued)

All suites must be approved for safety.

Dog and cat control, limits per house not per address. Owners seldom pick up after their dogs.

Why have a different process for carriage suites and garden suites? One of the main public concerns is parking when it comes to suites. Carriage suites allow more parking to be put on a lot while maintaining green space and landscaping. By discouraging carriage suites puts more cars on street parking.

Many people who are renters are typically either students or lower income, and many don’t have vehicles, choosing to bus or walk to work and university. Since the main concern I hear regarding suites is the parking, I support this endeavor.

City should get taxes for suites/garden units etc. as extra vehicles cause wear and tear on roads. The people that live in suites in our neighbourhood DO NOT WALK 3 blocks to work - THEY DRIVE.... so please do recognize more vehicles will be on the road. Please equalize the cost for builders and residences that have illegal suites and are collecting revenues NOT CLAIMED as income. Most of the suites also do not pull building permits for work done on their basements. THIS SCREAMS SAFETY ISSUES....

I agree with Garden suites and Carriage homes more so than secondary suites because I feel homeowners are required to do more planning and preparation (and hopefully provide parking as well), which means there would be fewer of this type of suite in Urban Neighbourhoods. Secondary suites make it too easy for people to just open their doors to anyone and let them park anywhere. I did not purchase a home in an Urban Neighbourhood so that I could live in a densely populated area of tenants.

I believe Suites are more easily managed than other forms of rentals due to the close proximity of the tenants with the owners/other tenants. Sufficient parking would need to be considered.

Each proposal for a secondary suite needs to pass a series of criteria, including being built to proper building code including electrical, and construction design. (There are a lot of Jimmy rigged, sketchy rentals offered out there, bedrooms without windows, shoddy electrical wiring, overloaded sockets etc.) Parking Has to be contained to the property. Street parking cannot be an option. There are areas in the city already fully congested with street parking, making it difficult for pedestrians to navigate, and hinders snow removal. Street parking should only be temporary and not permanent for any residence. Suite has to be easily accessible to emergency crews as well as mail carriers, delivery drivers, neighborhood canvassers etc. Safe.

Should not have suites on cul de sacs and dead end roads

Same concerns as the box above. Our street is already littered with illegal suites that I’d like to report and have them dealt with. I’m tired of cars parking all over the place, some people don’t care and tires are up literally over the curb and on my front lawn on my sprinkler head! Some houses have torn up their grass to make an illegal (?) 3rd parking lane of crushed rock for extra parking and houses have 6-7-8 vehicles coming and going, just getting ridiculous. Another house on our street has a truck parked literally on the front lawn. Very classy looking. No, our neighbourhoods are already getting overcrowded, I see the garbage trucks having trouble getting cans as they are between parked cars now... snow plows can’t do a good job due to the gauntlet of vehicles on either side of the road, kids aren’t playing road hockey like they used to due to the sheer volume of traffic zipping up and down the road. I think a crackdown on illegal suites needs to happen to be honest.

Need to include off street parking as a condition

Carriage suites AND garden suites should be allowed without public hearing or rezoning as long as they have lot size and proven ample parking and obtain a permit in the building of it. Get rid of rezoning requirement.
Comments (Continued)

As stated previously, if the city wants to go down this road with suites, they can only occur in new developments where parking has been taken into consideration or if a homeowner wants to have a suite, he/she must satisfy the city that 1) there is parking on the homeowners lot to accommodate one or more tenant vehicles, 2) there is on street parking directly in front of the homeowners residence (not across the street) to accommodate one or more tenant vehicles. Homeowners who don’t have suites MUST NOT have the on street parking in front of their homes compromised by neighbours’ tenants parking there. It is the right of homeowners to have those spaces available for visiting family and guests. If homeowners wanting suites cannot provide parking, then that should be all there is to it; NO SUITE.

If a home has a safe, healthy suite and can adequately provide parking a suite should not impact neighbours or neighbourhoods.

Having to disclose secondary income will likely lead to many citizens not engaging or participating in these dialogues or information gathering sessions. Although anonymity is guaranteed. Many have illegal suites and benefit from them economically as well as have no issues with their tenants. It is an affordable housing measurement/strategy and should be supported by our city rather than continue to build high rises.

The parking issue is HUGE...note Pacific Way and parking issues there, esp. in the winter.
I bought in the neighbourhood specifically for the fact it was not full of renters. I paid a premium price for that reason. I like the stability of a family orientated neighbourhood, where people take pride in where they live. I lived in a rural community for many years and finally moved away because people did not respect where they lived (as in a beautiful, quiet, wildlife, skiing etc. area)

Allowing these suites will dampen the effect of illegal suites.

There are many many illegal suites in Westsyde & it pisses me off that they create a parking issue, & put added pressure on utilities without contributing

I’m concerned, some will take advantage of developing their home or property, and I would like to see rules not to block or shade a neighbour’s property they already own. A type of grandfathering idea. To keep good neighbour camaraderie!

How is the city going to enforce the requirements for a suite? We complained about 2 houses in our area that had multiple suites, provided all the info the city asked for, for over 2 years... both houses still have their suites!!!!!!

Parking issues, single family neighbourhoods get turned into single family apartments areas with all the suites. We don’t want to live in a rental area, that’s why we bought in a single family area and I understand there are some illegal suites, but not one in every house.

Kamloops has just had the largest investment in multifamily developments in its history. This development only happened because of the demand of rentals being so high. Understandably having short term housing crisis is not desirable but without it these large investments would probably not happen.

Suites are very important for younger people trying to get into the market and also I believe we will see less people struggling to keep up with the costs of owning a home if suites are permitted.

I worked all my life to live in an executive, low density neighbourhood. I should have that option. I do not want to live in a parking lot.

I feel the suites would have to be permitted/ policed by the city or we will be dealing with a multitude of slum landlords.

Cost to buy a house is not attainable for many people unless they can have a suite with rental income.
**Comments (Continued)**

I think that we should move forward to allow suites in all of Kamloops.

It would be really great for the City of Kamloops if they took a similar approach to other municipalities like Kelowna and allowed rezoning of current non-conforming suites to be an easier process.

Suites have no more impact on parking than homes with families who have multiple vehicles and toys in their driveways (RV’s and Boats etc.). People should use their garages for their intended purpose, parking vehicles.

One thing to consider if allowing suites, the City should allow more free parking on the streets to give access for people to park on the City streets.

I cannot even begin to see, how the City will fix all the parking issues (look at the trouble the neighborhoods are in Vancouver areas) let alone some of the seedy characters that rent, and the landlord is an absent landlord living in another town. Come on City Council how will all of this be monitored??

Suites can be a positive but without proper regulation and enforcement of this regulation they can turn into a negative.

I think we need to get used to using cars less frequently and having fewer cars per household. As long as a neighbourhood has transit service (which our urban areas do), we shouldn’t be concerned about parking. We can make sure the disabled have priority access to parking (and parents with young kids?). Everyone else should be able to take transit or walk a block or two.

There has to be some kind of agreement between landowner and the city, to keep the property tidy. The tenants should have a responsible part too as they are the actual neighbors. I don’t like the feeling of entitlement that some feel they have, whether it be owner or tenant.

Suites need have approval from surrounding neighbourhood before they rent. It affects everyone around that house.

With the cost of buying a house being so expensive, suites help a lot of people be able to afford a mortgage.

My neighbor has an illegal suite. Their renter constantly cuts across my property and has no respect for my yard! Previous tenants had two vehicles causing street parking issues. Basically not impressed.

As a Realtor in Kamloops, I live in a house that qualifies as in-law suite as my parents are living there. I believe rental rates are very high for what value a person gets and that with a low vacancy rent that people who do rent are paying too much as the landlords can charge what they want. In addition, while advising clients that most homes we look at with suites are illegal suites, this is often not discouraging to buyers as they need the additional income. Most first time Buyers are unable to purchase a House as they are not affordable and they would need a legal suite in the home to help qualify and make mortgage payments.
Comments (Continued)

A duplex in our area recently added an apparently legal suite. So there are now three separate rental units, with about 6 vehicles and very little off street parking. The house next door recently added a legal suite. And there are no doubt illegal suites on McGill Rd. We have lived on McGill Rd for over 30yrs, where there are single family homes, many duplexes and Sahali Estates townhouses. In our experience there is often a greater level of care for properties and respect for neighbors from owners as opposed to renters. McGill Rd is also on a bus route, an already very busy residential street. Our neighborhood is already showing the negative impact of densification. Please do not make changes to allow more suites. It would seem to us that there has been a lack of control over legal/illegal suites to this point in time and would expect that this would continue exponentially with the increased suite proposal. Sensitive infill does not seem possible. We’re sure there are many studies that have shown the results of densification. Too many people depleting resources, more policing needed for road rage, that parking space, etc. The suite proposal is taking what some consider one problem, and if approved, will add so many more social problems and at some point, it can’t be turned back. Kamloopsians enjoy a nice lifestyle in our great community. Let’s keep it that way for the next generation. Thank you for the survey.

Where residences are not serviced by a lane to provide access to on-site parking, suites could be allowed provided the tenant does not own or require a car. Exceptions could be allowed for suites where the total number of vehicles owned by the Resident Owner and Tenant combined does not exceed the zoning requirement for the lot as a single family residence without a suite.

Many people like ourselves would never be able to afford to buy a home if we didn’t have a suite. Housing prices are so out of reach for many people and there is a huge shortage of affordable rentals. You’re kind of stuck if you can’t afford to buy and can’t find space to rent. Kamloops can’t be home if that is the case. The only people who will be opposed are the wealthy who don’t want their precious neighbourhood to have lower income people in them.

I support secondary suites; however there are prime examples of what our city will look like if nuisance rental properties are allowed to continue to exist and actions are not taken to enforce improvements. So, what are we going to do about houses that become an eyesore to the community at large? Council can make all the bylaws they want but if they aren’t enforced they might as well save the paper they are written on. We won’t be able to plant enough flowers to pretend we live in a nice city if any more nuisance properties pop up and are left to their own devices.

As a homeowner who pays top dollar for taxes and purchased a home worth a substantial amount of money, I totally disagree with the allowance of secondary suites anywhere and everywhere about the city without proper regulation. I will however agree that affordable housing is an issue and if the city does its job in regulating and approving such suites, I would be in favor of them as long as my concerns as listed above are met.

Renters in suites do not have a vested interest in the neighborhood and this is evident in their lack of socializing with nearby home owners. We bought in our neighborhood due to the lack of density and due to the large single home lots, and this would be ruined with the inclusion of suites.

I do not support secondary suites being allowed in more areas of Kamloops.

I think that the way a suite is permitted should be noted on making sure there is at least one spot for the tenant off street as to not make more congestion on our streets.
Comments (Continued)

I’m totally in favour of any type of suite—housing should be shared—it is ridiculous for one or two people to live in huge houses on large lots when others cannot find a place to live.

Parking will be a huge issue. I live on a cul de sac where there are approx 6 bsmt suites. None of the properties have on-site parking spots for tenants.

If the lot size permits it I think everyone should have the ability to zone for carriage/secondary/garden suites. This allows the opportunity for a large home/lot to provide additional income for them and additional homes for our community. By allowing these suites in areas not just downtown or near TRU it gives the non-university attending residents a fighting chance to find a place to live.

I live in Valleyview on a once quiet dead end cul-de-sac street. Two doors down from me is a home containing several (illegal?) suites and they all seem to have loud large trucks which idle and come and go at all times of the day and night. I have wondered if there is a city by law limiting the number of vehicles one home may have in the driveway. These people have 6-8 vehicles, mostly trucks. Two doors farther down, same story, multiple vehicles, multiple families living there. I know people need housing but we have to respect people who have bought homes in good faith thinking they were in a single family neighbourhood and are definitely not.

Suites should be allowed in all residential areas unless they pose a major problem!

The regulatory costs of implementing less restrictive permitting of secondary suites needs to be balanced with the cost of this process for the City and taxpayers and ensure the quality of living in affected neighbourhoods are not negatively impacted. In my experience renters never have the same investment or concern as homeowners do for the neighbourhood and its environment.

The market place is now solving any shortage of rental accommodation in Kamloops. There has been and will be more construction of rental units in the last couple of years and now underway than there has been in decades. E.g. Four buildings on TRU campus, new buildings across from TRU on McGill, planned expansion on Campus Heights for student housing, Kelson building on Summit Dr., downtown projects, north shore project.

The City’s Development Dept. can confirm the numbers

Each neighbour should have right to decide
Even street by street
Complete reversal of existing restrictions is totally unfair to those who worked hard to acquire their home
In neighbourhoods designed to be single-family

Listen to the voice of the people. Open up a valuable opportunity to densify the crippling urban sprawl which city planners have allowed over the last 50 years. Most of our prime lower level farm land has been sacrificed to development.

We have illegal suites in our neighborhood and have found that renters in these suites have a negative impact. Issues with parking, noise, garbage, pets and disregard for strata bylaw rules are just a few of the ongoing complaints.

It doesn’t matter what we say the city doesn’t listen anyway

I recently moved from Clayton Heights in surrey to get away from the secondary rental suit issues there, the area became over saturated with vehicles causing parking problems, as well the crime increased dramatically as homes were being sold transformed into rental suite businesses, fewer and fewer homes were actually owned by home owners but by investors and I am already seeing it here I know of one home we looked at that an investor purchased from under us and made it a rental unit. So if we allow this in all urban areas you will see a drastic change in the scope of people buying and entering the city. I say start slow and see how it goes and only in areas closer to the downtown core.
Comments (Continued)

illegal suites in my area have turned the area into a ghetto, with junk piled everywhere and vehicles parked on the lawns and blocking the streets

Heavy emphasis on Sensitive Infill including parking and impact on neighbours

Parking seems to be the number one concern that is heard regarding secondary suites and I agree. However I do not believe that by allowing these suites to become legal we will increase parking issues. I currently live in Pineview and have a legal suite. On my street (Primrose Court) and the one below (Foxtail) there are at least 20 if not more other homes with illegal suites (one home even has 2). The current rules are not being enforced and the parking issues already exist.

I believe that it should be neighbourhood voted on I live in Juniper if homeowners in other areas want suites that has nothing to do with me, I don’t want them in my neighbourhood. I worked hard for 50 years to be able to afford a single family home in a single family neighbourhood. If those reading this think I am selfish not so, 50 years of working and paying taxes I think I can have some say in the type of neighbourhood I want to live in. The other problem I have with this proposal is once the zoning is changed we will never be able to change it back. I don’t think there will be immediate impact on communities but in another 10 - 15 years there will be. This issue in my opinion has not considered long term effects. Also suites will require homes to have a minimum of 200 amp hydro service, is hydro able to supply the needed requirements for homes with suites now and for the future.

The private sector is investing millions in providing rental housing ... this new approach may negatively impact those investors. No evidence that suites reduce housing costs.... mortgage helpers can backfire on top of negatively affecting neighbourhoods

I am not against a few regulated suites, but the number of illegal suites in my neighborhood is crazy.

It is not the suite or number of suites that creates impact; rather it is the integrity within the property and suites

Main Concern: How will the city make sure the suites aren't filled by daily rental sites like AirBnB or some other rental sites?

Hopefully it helps people!

I think that if a person has to rely on rental income from a suite to help with the mortgage they probably could afford it in the first place

Thanks for the survey. Let’s get away from the need to keep building and expanding our land footprint. Many of our concerns with transportation issues and infrastructure costs and repairs can be reduced with ‘sensible & sensitive’ allowance of secondary suites. Our young people who want to buy a home can both save money by living in a suite and buying a home with a suite ease their financial obligations.

Leave the addition of suites etc. to developers who are in the rental business, not the average Joe homeowner. The city cannot regulate renters/rentals in someone’s basement or yard, i.e. how many ppl are living in a suite etc. As far as a child staying at home to go to school, they should already have a bedroom therefore they don't need a suite. All my children managed just fine attending TRU. As far as a mortgage helper, maybe ppl are buying over their head.

My neighbor has two separate renters and six cars in total causing parking issues resulting in friction with other home owners. Councillor Kathy Sinclair needs further thought into this issue and consider the wellbeing of tax paying home owners who buy into areas of single family homes for that reason and pay taxes accordingly. We do not need fights for parking disrupting our neighborhoods.
Comments (Continued)

Landlords need more rights/protection if you want to see more suites for rental. I know several who have legal suites and have had several bad experiences renting, so they choose not to rent, leaving valuable space unused.

We have a legal suite where an aging family member lives. The three houses next to us are duplexes where the upstairs and downstairs are both rented out on both sides. So essentially 12 rental units. The ones that are owner occupied maintain their yards and keep an eye on tenants regarding noise etc. The ones that have no owners present have become unsightly properties and are always louder than the owner occupied.

As other have stated parking is an issue. Especially in the ones that are not owner occupied. The duplexes have a garage and a spot for one car in the driveway. When you have 4 rental units in a duplex there is nowhere else to park but on the street. More than a few times I have had to leave notes on cars not to block our driveway.

If the City opens up more suite rentals (which I support) I would make sure the property owner has parking available in the driveway and make it mandatory that it be given to the rental. Also I would make rules that rentals can only be limited to every third house, to spread out the parking. Renters are not willing to walk more than two houses to park their cars. The city limits how close beer and wine stores can go to each other why not the rental units.

Our number one priority needs to be decreasing our footprint. It is utterly ridiculous to me that people care more about parking availability than the future of our planet, our species and our children.

Parking is my major concern.

Kamloops creating a dependency on rental income to afford family homes in many areas. The more people you concentration into a smaller area the more strain on infrastructure.

Densification is a good way to help fight climate change.

Many homes have beautiful views and could lose those views if Garden Suites or large Carriage houses are permitted. More suites, more Garden Suites and Carriage Houses create more RV’s in driveways, more vehicles on our streets, more pets and problem tenants. Residential owners with any type of suite should also be required to pay more fees for Utilities and Taxes. Renters should not be allowed to park in front of others houses!!!!! Those people that are Landlords should have to register with Provincial and Federal Governments so the proper taxes are collected from their suite income.

The City needs to be more encouraging of suites. The housing prices are getting too high for young adults to buy their first home without a mortgage helper and with the aging population and the ridiculous cost of senior living families should be able to have suites for parents.

WE SWEAT AND SAVE IN ORDER TO ELEVATE OUR COMFORT AND BUY OUR DREAM HOME WHERE IT’S NICE AND QUIET. IF YOU GIVE CONSIDERATION FOR MORE SUITES, THIS WILL HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON OUR HOUSE VALUES, OUR PEACE OF MINDS AND OUR FAITH IN THE CITY TO PROTECT OUR INVESTMENT AND WAY OF LIFE. (NO MORE SUITES IN ABERDEEN). Thank you.

If you can’t park on your own property do not have a suite. If you have other family members in your home find parking for them elsewhere.

Secondary suites outside the urban core may need a permitting process given only about every 4th lot or so would suit one.

Lot sizes in Kamloops are too small. Parking is difficult in certain areas. Better transit is vital to the future plans of Kamloops to increase urban density.

How will suites affect real estate values? It may increase real estate inflation.
Comments (Continued)

When I had a second bathroom put in, I asked the contractor to get a permit but I have no evidence that he actually did so. I realize in retrospect this is my error but I would hate to be penalized when I hired a long-term, established business person to do the work. Contractors should be responsible for pulling permits. The onus shouldn’t be completely on the homeowner as most of us are novices when dealing with home renovations. They should be fined if they don’t do as the homeowner requested. I had no reason to think that he wasn’t getting a permit as I had requested. My imperative was to provide a safe, accessible space for my elderly parents as quickly as I could. Once my remaining parent can’t live with me any longer I will have to look into making it a legal suite. Considering the state of many other suites out there, I would hope the whole bathroom permit issue won’t be a problem or I won’t have much incentive to go legit.

Council must recognize that allowing suites is something they cannot take back and serious consideration to not adopting suites should be mandated. Peace, quiet and property enjoyment is seriously altered when neighbourhoods become crammed with suites for owners financial gains only at the expense of others. There are other ways to offset the burden of rental accommodations in the City without impacting our quiet neighbourhoods and affecting years of well-earned equity. Suites always cause parking problems and noise concerns. Across from my house if a legal suite that Council approved even after lots of opposition and now at 6:30 every morning we have a renter starting up and idling his truck with a noisy muffler waking everyone in close proximity. If people need rental accommodation place units in rural areas or areas outside the core of the City.

I understand why some homeowners wish to have a suite. I also do not think there is anything wrong with a suite as long as the regulations address problems such as parking. It is unfair to other neighbours if there is no longer parking in front of their own house for themselves or for their guests. Because of renters in all the extra suites. Find a solution to the parking problem first.

I do worry that secondary suites may provide a stopgap measure which may delay a more necessary densification, but honestly I haven’t looked for any research on it...

I think having permanent tenants within homes with suites are better than homes that do temporary housing such as Airbnb. Do you know who is living in the home and it helps Kamloops to densify plus provide affordable housing for those who can’t purchase a home.

Expanding the usage of suites and garden/carriage houses will help keep utility costs lower for the city by developing areas where utilities are already in place. Suites help renters and landlords in different ways. As a renter I always rented from residential suites, I never wanted to live in a plain apartment building and liked living somewhere different. Now as a homeowner, we never would have bought our first home if it didn’t have a suite. I am very much in favour of expanding the zoning.

Kamloops needs to legalize hundreds of suites already existing and allow new secondary suites throughout all neighbourhoods. I know the city really has no control over size of houses, but current trends of ever larger homes are not sustainable for the environment. Larger homes require more building materials as well as more electricity to light and energy to heat. Allowing secondary suites at least allows home owners to increase the number of people living in these larger homes.

Suites should have permits and inspections along with proper parking.
Comments (Continued)

In other communities where secondary suites are prevalent, it is impossible to park on the street, the streets are constantly busy, and the population is transient. We have some secondary suites in our neighbourhood and they do not fit in well with the other homes. Cars are often parked on front lawns, and renters speed up and down the street not knowing where young children live and play. On occasion renters have been responsible for crime on our block. We have friends in East Vancouver and they continually complain about how their neighbourhood has been ruined by overcrowding. It certainly has not helped make homes more affordable there and I doubt if it will here.

Single family homes should mean just that, single family homes. The market will determine the price of housing.

I think you should be allowed suites if you live in the house and can properly manage your suite. You control the noise the looks and can see first-hand how your tenant behaves and treats the neighbors.

This must be well thought out and all issues resolved to a reasonable level before we implement it. In the past this has not been done and the city runs around trying to Band-Aid solutions after the fact. Not good enough let’s take our time and do it right. Parking will be a nightmare and so will snow clearing if everyone parks on the street.

The abject failure of the Bylaw Enforcement department to deal with rental suites (legal!) in my neighbourhood over the past few years demonstrates to me the potential issues broad zoning changes may create. Traffic was an issue... too many cars, parking on the lawn, etc. Noise. Too many unrelated people sharing units. Smoking dope in the yard, in spite of the neighbouring house having a legal daycare within. The value of the homes nearby were clearly impacted. In spite of neighbourhood petitions to deal with the illegal activities, it took months to see even a slight improvement. If suites like this are to become commonplace, the Bylaw group will need to expand exponentially and actually use the teeth they will have to be given.

I get the sense that this exercise is designed to feel good about ‘solving’ social housing, but the proponents have little or no direct understanding of the consequences, intended or unintended. The road to hell is paved with good intentions, but I have no interest in having to drive that road home from work every day.

The reality is that a good number of these suites will not be owner occupied resulting in messy yards, crowded parking and transient neighbours. I bought in a single family dwelling neighbourhood because that’s what I wanted. Zone future developments as allowing suites if you want but leave my zoning alone.

While I agree secondary suites can be beneficial to those that cannot afford their own home or choose not to, the experience I have had as a home owner is that renters typically do not invest the same care and concern for the neighbourhood. As well, I do not believe an entire house should be a rental (primary dwelling and suite). At least one of the units should be owner occupied. Finally, parking can be an issue. I realize home owners do not ‘own the road’ but is extremely frustrating when frontage is maintained (shovelling for example) for our use and renters use it as their primary parking space, even if parking is available in at the house they rent.
Some city streets within Kamloops were not designed to accommodate suites in single family dwellings. Homeowners park on the street making it narrower where only one vehicle can go up or down the street at a time and the cul-de-sac at the top is too small that even the garbage truck and plow trucks cannot go around it and must go back and forth to turn around. It doesn't help there is an illegal suite in the one house at the top of the cul-de-sac and tenants are parking on the street.

We moved from Alberta to Kamloops in late 2017, and were surprised by the high costs of rentals and even home to purchase. By allowing more secondary suites, this would provide more housing options, and hopefully encourage lower rents so that living can be more affordable.

Please have enough controls to alleviate problems with bad tenants. Bad tenants can bring down a whole street/neighborhood.

I am concerned that the city of Kamloops is considering the change in zoning only to incur a higher tax threshold

Please consider upping the amount of dogs as well on properties that have a suite of some sort. That’s another reason a lot of people are homeless! Because landlords already have 2 dogs and cannot except another on the property due to bylaws.

The real focus needs to be on keeping housing prices down and I am not sure how suites will affect the value of housing, currently the homes for sale with helper suites are priced higher, housing with suite potential will also increase. Carriage houses are a good idea but a minimum lot size with adequate parking, new construction with purpose built suites and adequate parking should be allowed no matter the neighbourhood. An existing house that was not purpose built as a duplex (up and down) should not be permitted, unless it is done properly with proper fireguards between floors and separate services, furnaces, hydro meter, etc... Tenant safety should be the single most important issue, when secondary suites are looked at and should be inspected and permitted as any business is required, far too many slum lords out there taking advantage of people and making a quick buck, cutting corners with haphazard suites.

My main complaint is the lack of regulations for home suites and the increase of vehicles parked on the roads (we have experienced cars parked behind our driveway). I believe that there needs to also be a higher city tax paid for dual or triple suite homes. As for carriage houses and garden suites, there needs to be a minimum size lot determined for the extra structures.

Need guidance on how to go about building a garden site. Perhaps a list of contractors willing to do this type of work and range of pricing. Should allow prefab that falls within certain criteria for looks and fit.

Those of us who can barely make it financially, but do not qualify for any assistance, should still be able to find places that are decent and affordable. We should be able to be comfortable where we live, if we have a problem we should be confident in going to our landlord and things are going to be dealt with.

Suites are a necessity almost given the shortage of rentals in the city as well as cost of housing.

I deal with a lot of students through my job. I see too many of them struggling to find a place to live and many of them end up in motels for months. I rent out my suite to students and I love it. It’s mutually beneficial and it allows a normally disused space to become a home for someone.
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My biggest concern about secondary suites is fire safety. Parking is the next concern.

We rented our suite for 13 years with no interference from the city or the neighbours. It was a crucial mortgage helper. We live in Barnhartvale, so did not attract TRU students, but provided necessary housing for folks pushed out of the city core by students.

Go visit a street in the winter that has suites. You’ll find a really narrow road caused by plows that have had to work around all the cars. Not so much this winter, but I guarantee a fire truck couldn’t get down our street last winter. The suite and homeowner cars need to be regulated.

How about making a different property tax bracket for houses with suites. They are using more resources and services. You can bet your bottom dollar they aren’t claiming the income with CRA.

The City of Kamloops wants a university town and also Infilling so to me that would mean more suites! Many young people cannot afford the rents that come with low vacancy, and the high end apartments that keep being built have rent too high for the average young person. We are years behind Kelowna, et al!

Very high percent people already have suites any way if you legalize the suites then city can make more tax money and home owner also going to get help for mortgage payment. Thanks

Assessment on my rental properties have gone crazy but I am not allowed to increase rent to match. Give me a tax break on properties that have a rental space so I can help resolve the housing crisis.

It is reprehensible that Kamloops allows the large number of illegal suites to continue to be unregulated and that the city does not require the payment of extra water, sewer and garbage service fee collection. Just think of the extra revenue that could be collected if the service fees alone could be collected. Property taxes should reflect the extra value of the property also seeing that the owner is being allowed to collect moneys from the tenant. Let’s get some kind of equity happening on this issue. I for one am disgusted with the situation of unfairness and am not really assured that these issues will ever be addressed. How much revenue should and could be collected from the increased income from a residential property that has a properly constructed suite? How about at least a 50% fee on the tax that would regularly be taxed on a residential home with no suite. Then maybe the taxes could reflect a more equitable rate for the value of the property. It’s not hard to find which homes are currently having illegal suites. I hope the city will listen to reason on this issue.

In the sagebrush neighbourhood most homeowners do not have the required off street parking, if there is parking off street it is not being used. The average home has at least two vehicles parked on street.

We used to live in a highly congested area in Clayton Heights (Cloverdale, BC) and we quickly saw the problems that came from secondary suites in the neighborhood. There was NO street parking available for visiting guests because the streets were SO packed with residents from the area. Sometimes our guests would have to park 5 or 6 blocks away from our house. We also had increased crime from the amount of rentals in the neighborhood. It was no longer a safe family neighborhood. When the city finally figured out this was getting out of control, they tried to remove secondary suites and people were furious to be losing their homes (the renter’s) and petitions were created to keep the suites. The problem can never be resolved in that area. It’s too bad, because it really was a nice family neighborhood before all the secondary suites went in. Take a look at the Clayton Heights area in Cloverdale, and you’ll see all the problems that area has now.

More pet friendly suites NEED to be available. More low income suites need to be made available.
Comments (Continued)

I own a home in Aberdeen. I am surrounded by renters on all sides. I am appalled at the way the renters park in front of my house sometimes blocking my driveway for hours. The street I live on is very narrow and cannot absorb the added pressure of multiple additional vehicles per address. Why should long time home owners have to bear all the extra hassles? If my friends or family come to visit they have no place to park because of the average four extra cars per household. Ridiculous! Address this issue prior to enacting changes or there will be pushback from home owners. What is the recourse for long time home owners and taxpayers?

Some houses have 2 and even more suites which even further compromise the parking and character of residential streets. How would that be circumvented or addressed?

Bylaw enforcement concerns

The problem facing the city going forward is one of fairness. There are so many illegal suites now that do not pay their share of the cost of services and trying to bring them into compliance will be a major costly exercise in futility!

make process easier to conform to zoning regulations

TRU NEEDS TO BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE MASSIVE NUMBERS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS. IT SHOULD BE MANDATORY THAT THEY LIVE ON CAMPUS OR STOP BRINGING THEM HERE. THEY ARE THE MAIN CAUSE OF HIGH RENTS AND A SERIOUS SHORTAGE OF APPARTMENTS. IT NEEDS TO STOP.

Parking and vehicle access on residential streets is significantly impacted by rental homes and homes with secondary suites. The number of vehicles that each home can have must be regulated. Proving that a home has sufficient parking available for the primary home is important to know, just as it is if there is a suite. There needs to be more control for parking so that streets are accessible and parking is available to everyone. Allowing a rental house to have six vehicles, when the home / driveway supports only four, is not good management - especially when there are many homes on a street with too many vehicles.

If tenants are not good renters, landlords should be able to immediately give notice of eviction any time of the year. I have seen some pretty horrific basement suites that landlords have not looked after, and not fit for human beings, rental costs were ridiculous. How will the city attend to these type of situations?

We lived beside a house with an illegal rental suite. Every six months renters came and went, moving trucks and random vehicles were a constant. The most stressful episode was when the neighbours rented to drug addicts, and two overdoses occurring at the property. The homeowners probably wanted an income to help pay for their mortgage, but we as the neighbours had to deal with all of their poor choices.

Thankfully the suite was shut down and the homeowners moved away. I can only imagine how much longer this would have gone on if the suite had been legal and permitted by the city. This is not an experience I would like any other family to go through.

My biggest concern would be the renting to thieves and criminals. A record check might lesson that concern

I’m in Guerin Creek almost every home has a suite some have 2 we are the only ones legal parking is a problem

The City should do all it can to make homeowners keep up the property so as not to affect property values, or negatively affect neighbors.

Lived on a cul de sac...lots of illegal suites makes parking on the street a disaster.
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Disappointed that the city has allowed so many illegal suites to exist up to now.

I am not totally against secondary suites. But the bylaw where 2 people who live within 100 meters of the suite for the right to have a concern investigated has to be gone. There needs to be a standard form anyone can complete on any secondary suite concern. I was told there are only two people who handle all secondary suite concerns, and the odds of them getting to your concern is next to nil. This has to change. Hire more people to get this done. If there was a team who would guarantee any secondary suite concerns would be investigated I would gladly embrace every single family dwelling to have a suite. I have seen the loss of life after a fire in the owner of the dwelling area killed all the renters in the basement. I hope to never see that again.

Enforcement of bylaws or why bother going thru this process?

Suites should be permitted in ALL neighbourhoods, provided that parking can be accommodated on-site.

We see many areas in town where suites are allowed and homeowners can’t even park in front of their own homes because of lack of parking. Visitors even have a hard time finding parking. They shouldn’t allow suites anywhere in the city, but on a case to case bases. It should be based on the neighbors input along with parking concerns etc.

There is talk of providing extra parking on the residential lots themselves so this would result in front yards turning into parking lots destroying the beauty of a neighborhood

Suites provide many families with a means to provide for their families as well as add to the rentals available in our city.

We made a significant investment to go through the proper channels to put in a legal suite, additional suites in addition to the significant number of rental complexes currently being developed (Aberdeen views, orchards walk, 315 St. Paul, 444 St. Paul, TRU apartments at the reach, Kelson development on summit etc) could hamper the ability of owners to rent units in the future. As well, the school in juniper is at capacity, having additional suites in the neighborhood will impact my kids’ education and potentially the ability to stay in our neighborhoods school.

Kamloops has a shortage of rental housing and greatly needs more suites.

I signed an agreement that secondary suites WERE NOT allowed in the Benchlands. Several homes have them. Parking and theft is an issue, and congestion.

I wish the city would rescind secondary suites in the Benchlands. Actually in all of Juniper. The area is littered with cars. Totally interfere with snow removal.

Any property that has a legal or illegal suite must provide off street parking for all their tenants.

Make the downtown more walkable so that people can enjoy the downtown more
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Stop worrying about parking, or deal with it separately. There are already suites throughout the city. If you’re not getting complaints now, they’re not suddenly going to start. Other cities haven’t seen this as an issue after they moved forward with allowing suites everywhere. I’ve lived near homes that had 9 vehicles. How do you reconcile that it’s OK so long as it’s a single family home, but not OK if it has a suite? Also, please ditch some of the things that restrict suite development. Separate hot water tanks? Noise abatement in the ceiling? Three side-by-side parking? These were put in place as hurdles to discourage suite development. If you’re going to start allowing suites, charge an annual fee, consider taking an encouraging approach and look for ways to assist people to be compliant. Get rid of unnecessary hurdles! Perhaps take a look at the Vancouver model; look at how they actively encourage and help people in this regard - it’s great to see, and a much friendlier approach than Kamloops tends to take.

I really hope you will rely on information from other communities more so than the NIMBY responses you’re likely to get. Please base your decisions on evidence.

House ownership is costly in Kamloops, having a house with a suite was mandatory for our family to afford to move to this city. I would happily own a house without a suite if we could afford one. Suites seem to be a commonality in Kamloops.

Why can’t carriage homes or garden suites be built for homeowners? The cost of owning a house is way beyond the reach of many. Why is the City helping People who can afford to build these suites to rent them out instead of helping people to zone smaller lots and homes for their needs and lifestyle? Root of the problem is to create diversity for ALL income levels to achieve their dream to own a home. Not a house.

I would love to be able to have a suite, however, the Landlord and Tenancy Act gives more rights to tenants than it does to the homeowners. Homeowners should be the ones with the ability to make decisions about their own homes.

This initiative will raise the cost of homes which are already out of reasonable reach. Kamloops needs concrete towers, not basement suites. No one wants a mortgage helper. They want a private affordable home. No one wants to hear their neighbors having sex or brushing their teeth through thin wood walls with poor soundproofing. Look at other urban cities. Concrete is everywhere. Why Kamloops insists on building cheap wooden apartments boggles the mind. I don’t want to hear people chewing their food in the next suite.

As long as suites are safe and include area for parking I am for it and would also like to see discussion and options on areas available for Tiny Houses - on wheels.

What about developments providing units under 600ft2 - inexpensive, basic bare-land strata’s. Providing affordable family and/or retiree housing.

Parking is a huge issue in our area as only one side of the street is available for legal parking and often vehicles are illegally parked on the wrong side or in front of driveways. There will also be an increase in traffic on the main roads, which are often used as ’speedways’ and an alternate to the main highway.

Do not allow any secondary suites in Strata Developments

As someone who has lived in a suite and has also owned a house in a neighborhood with several suites I think the city needs to be more thoughtful. Suites are far too often poorly constructed with rents exceeding a comparable apartment rental. There is also the issue that the low availability is somewhat artificial due to the lack of student housing and speculation buying of near campus housing. This combined with the current construction of high density housing near the university would negate the need for additional suites and most likely result in more poorly constructed ones to capture market before those are completed. I am tired of slum lord council members wanting to line their pockets with such foolish poorly thought out planning.
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What will happen with all the illegal suites there is no incentive for this behavior to stop.
Suites are not covered under the home owners insurance!
Suites are often rented at a high cost to the renter.
The city should build more low income homes, student rentals and subsidized
Rental units...
The city is building many suites for the homeless but what happens for seniors or low income families.
Legalizing suites or changing the bylaw will not improve the rental availability rent is still very expensive.

My biggest concern is parking and traffic on streets that are already in disrepair
do not pack us in like sardines...the openness of Westsyde is why we prefer to live here despite the half hour drive into major shopping areas...

The city should provide inspectors to make sure any suites available for rent initially meet appropriate standards, for health and safety and provide clean water, hot water and a well maintained and approved heat source. Also, a procedure should be put in place to provide a reasonable time frame and path for the home owner to evict an unsuitable, problematic renter without a costly court case.

It’s already hard enough to find a house without a suite I don’t feel like more are needed

The established character and wishes of the neighbourhood should be of primary concern. There are serious problems (example along Overlander) where absentee landlords or their agents have converted duplexes into illegal fourplexes. The area consequentially suffers from the lack of city knowledge or anyone’s supervision. Many areas are now also encountering problems with drug use.

I think Kamloops is far behind in the legality of secondary suites and has a very aggressive and unfriendly rental market because of that. I think allowing more secondary suites that are legal would allow more construction involving secondary suites as mortgage helpers.

Please make sure no on street parking. Must have adequate and proper off street parking. Must also meet fire building and proper permit codes.

Reduce or eliminate costs associated with any permits required. Increased revenue in water & sewer & taxes is good. Parking is a problem in Aberdeen, Sahali, Downtown due to small lots. Other areas like Valleyview, Westsyde etc have very large lots so parking isn’t a problem

My opinion I think that a lot of people think suites are great ideas but realize after they aren’t. If or when they sell their house usually a person would. Buy the house for an investment and Rent the upstairs and the suite separate. Then you start getting the problems in the neighbourhood cause you have people that don’t care about anyone else.

While I agree rental suites have their place in select neighbourhoods, we deliberately bought in a neighbourhood that doesn’t allow rental suites. I completely disagree with the motion of allowing suites in all residential neighbourhoods.

The questions as asked above, cloud the issue, family be it parents or children are not suite tenants. Our experience is greedy landlords who do not need the mortgage helper but want the money at the expense and inconvenience of their neighbors. They do not providing adequate tenant parking and they circumvent the system rules ignoring their fair share of legal landlord permits, charges and taxes etc. The City should first enforce the illegal suite rules and regulations and set an example for those of us without tenants, how they will handle the problems that will arise by allowing more.
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Already some areas allow suites and others do not. Many people have used that as a guide in where they have wanted to purchase or build. It would be unfair to those tax paying residents to change the rules on them now. If someone wishes to have a suite, for reasons which are financial or family related, or help to the renting population, areas already exist in which to do that.

Rental to be encouraged currently and moving forward. Enforcement of illegal rentals needs to be addressed and increased.

It is harder for young people to qualify for mortgages these days, making suites legal allows them to use the rental income to help qualify. Making suites legal also allows for aging parents to live with their children so they can be taken care of or young couples to live with their parents while they save up to get a place of their own. The extra cost to make a suite legal is daunting, making it less expensive and easier will promote more people to declare their illegal suites.

Please consider addressing the issue of legalizing suites that are currently non-legal. Not enough has been said about the issue or process involved.

Setbacks need to be 3 feet from laneway and 3 feet on side streets.

Parking is an issue. We have it in our neighbourhood. Renters don’t usually care about the character of the neighbourhood and its history. An established neighbourhood has roots with its citizens that we all depend on.

The City must conduct a thorough review of the infrastructure of its utilities to assure that the suites that are to be accommodated do not over burden the current systems in place.

The City must conduct a more thorough review of the patterns an effect that suites will have on traffic created by the suites.

Suites should be of minimum size and they must be licensed and confirm to code. This also then requires that good neighbor agreements and bylaws should be enforced.

Illegal suites strains the current renters without control to own heat and lack of hot water when landlords above ground continuously run dishwasher, washer, and multiple showers.

limiting the number of people living in a suite - i.e. a one bedroom suite should not have 6 people living there.

I think lawful parking is a vehicle owner issue and not a secondary suite issue. Everyone is expected to park lawfully, whether it’s in their private driveway or on the street. Cars are allowed to be parked on the street as long as they comply with parking bylaws, regardless of if it’s owned by a tenant, roommate, relative, homeowner, etc. Many suite occupants are students who don’t have a car and rely on public transit anyway.

Hurry and get it done. People are starving. People are living on the street.

Hurry

In reality we already have suites in every Urban city neighborhood whether zoned for it or not. Is there any catastrophic overburdening of the city services now, or catastrophically congested neighborhoods, parking wise?? The reason that there are already thousands of illegal suites is because there hasn’t been enough zoning to allow for it currently. This situation was created by the city’s lack of zoning, and the onerousness of going through the re-zoning and hearing process. Unless the city wants thousands more illegal suites, this zoning amendment needs to go through and the process for legal suites needs to be streamlined. Thanks for your time.

The City must conduct a thorough review of the infrastructure of its utilities to assure that the suites that are to be accommodated do not over burden the current systems in place.
Please allow more suites and make Kamloops more affordable for students and families.

My problem is with duplexes that are now 4-plexes they affect neighbourhoods, we have a few in our general area, they only seem to have effect on neighbors as they densify further, without proper consideration for parking noise and neighbours. (single family)

Thank you for considering more rental suites of any type. These are desperately needed within the city or we may face many residents having to leave where prices are lower.

Although we need more housing stock, over densification of urban neighbourhoods can create many issues with parking, traffic, noise and general livability of why you moved there in the first place.

If I have an illegal suite why would I take a permit out to have it checked and then find out that it would take too many $$$ to make it legal, and now you know that I have a suite and going to continue on as an illegal one?? What is penalties now?  How can a person get it checked before doing all this? Can we get a set of regulations so that we can check this out first?? Or any info.

If the city wants to make suites more common, then they need to also address other concerns that will arise from them.  How will complaints be handled (especially at night when there is no bylaw enforcement)?  Will the city actually do something about nuisance properties?  Where will the budget come for dealing with increased noise and parking complaints (will all property owners have to foot the bill or will it come from costs associated with owning a suite)?  How can the city ensure suite owners are paying their (increased) share of taxes (income and property) and utilities?  Will the city actively ensure suites and previously built illegal suites are following all bylaws and building codes?  At this point, I don’t have faith that the city would deal with these issues since they turn a blind eye to both illegal suites and nuisance properties.

I think everyone’s concern is not really the suites themselves, but the attitude of the house owner.  Is this owner responsible and capable of choosing good tenants, who do not negatively impact the neighbourhood?  If a tenant breeches a written contract regarding behaviour that negatively affects a neighbourhood...is this owner capable of reacting appropriately to circumvent this issue?

Parking issues for the renters could cause issues for other home owners in an area if adequate parking on the property (with a suite) is not available.

I have no problems with the idea of secondary suites but I think that they should have separate garbage and recycling cans. Also some areas have no street parking like Tranquille Road From SouthHill to the airport. We used to not be able to park on the street. We now have a couple of basement suites in the area and people are starting to park on the road.

Would like to see more benefits and incentives for home owners who put in a suite. More resources on how to proceed and requirements for putting in secondary suites. i.e. Makes it easier to find and understand building codes and bylaws pertinent to developing a suite. More flexibility for unusual properties that don’t fit the mould, i.e. Panhandle lots should be assessed on their individual characteristics.
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My primary concern is with parking, access and safety.

I’m concerned that a blanket approval without looking at street widths could be a problem. I live in a cul-de-sac, but not at the end where the turnaround is. I *believe* the FAQ mentioned cul-de-sacs, but I wasn’t sure if that means just the end or the whole street. Regardless though, parking is already tight on my street with two vehicles parked on opposite sides.

Loosen restrictions for homeowners regarding owners performing their own electrical work. They are currently excluded for a permitting process allowing homeowners to perform their own work.

While trying to make more affordable housing options, allowing suites like this is not a good idea. Renters say they want legislated price caps and whatnot, but as a home owner there are certain costs to owning a house. Allowing more rental properties will not reduce the costs a home owner incurs while renting. When you take into account income tax, increased property tax, the desire to have it as a mortgage helper, the cost of maintenance to the property/suite and necessary savings for fixing damage not covered by the damage deposit, etc... etc... it is not fiscally responsible to rent a suite in most cases. In addition the unfair policies towards homeowners by the rental tenancy board encourage the home owners to be very selective when someone applies to rent their suite/property. Meaning the most vulnerable, i.e. families, low income, addicts are very unlikely to be offered rent at a more affordable rate because the homeowner must take this into account and increase rent accordingly based on the risk the potential renter may create. When I look at what has been happening in Barnhartvale I am disgusted. It was a neighbourhood that was full of families in the 90’s. It was affordable and still is affordable for families. But you look at the socio-economic indicators of those moving into Barnhartvale now, there is less education and less income earning capacity. You see when you look at the dramatic decrease in house maintenance in BHV in the past 10 years. Then you invite crime into the neighbourhood and a lack of policing. There are cars and houses being broken into daily in BHV. I do not want this happening in my neighbourhood. When purchasing a house an intelligent person looks at what is around them. Are there train tracks? Ok, I will not buy there. Is the school decent? Are there homeless shelters nearby? Etc... I did this when I purchased my home. If I bought a house next to the tracks I couldn’t complain because only an idiot buys next to the tracks and complains because they have been there a lot longer and are a strong economic driver for our city and country. But I do have a say if someone wants to destroy neighbourhoods because other people cannot save their money to save their lives. They would rather spend it on drugs and cigarettes than save to buy a house. I don’t want to increase the rental availability in Kamloops. I am very strongly left in political ideology, but I will not bend over backwards to destroy my community and my quality of life. I have invested in property for myself and my family at a young age because of hard work and sacrifice.
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We need to start considering our footprint- environmentally and economically. We have a housing shortage in Kamloops which is unacceptable for a University town with a high demographic of international students.

Most of the issues I see with suites don’t really have to do with the neighborhood or the zoning. The problem most neighbors have is when tenants start acting up the landlord is in no position to remove the tenant. The RTA is very one sided. I know many landlords that just won’t rent their suites anymore because of the RTA.

I know I said more secondary suites should be allowed throughout the whole city; however, some specific areas may not be conducive to supporting such suites if properties are not well positioned on landscape or have poor parking in area.

I’m concerned with more noise from more people and or potential pets. This city is already filled with ignorant dog owners that don’t care that their dog barking annoys people. Last thing we want is more congested in areas. Also traffic and more cars Around look like crap and cause more noise and make things busier.

Thanks

I think it’s a great idea to get more suites on the market. Having less illegal suites makes great sense.

My main concerns are listed above, but bear repeating. I am concerned that additional suites will mean more cars parked on the street. We can hardly get down the street as it is, and very hard to find additional parking when friends or relatives come by, because parking is all used up. Parked cars by suite owners impede snow removal and obscure vision when backing up. Secondly, I do not want to see more drug houses in the city, and I can see this happening with increased garden or carriage suites (separate buildings).

Allowing secondary suites all over Kamloops, will most definitely add some more taxes getting paid. We all know there is already many unapproved suites in existence. Just get these suites approved for any and all safety features and then make them legal. After that, add a % for secondary suites, based on suite income and not just because there is a suite, as not everyone rents their extra space, all the time. More people will be inclined to rent space, to ease the burden of the huge shortage we have in Kamloops, if they know there is no more threat of fines, for renting something that is presently illegal. Catch up Kamloops. We are behind other cities, like Kelowna, who are already doing this.

With new mortgage rules and stress tests suites are needed to help keep housing affordable for the homeowner. I live in Aberdeen, there is no way I could afford to live in this area on a single income without a suite. Homeowners shouldn’t have to jump through so many hoops to make a suite legal. Parking isn’t an issue... my renters don’t park in my neighbor’s driveway… they park on the street. Other residents should not be able to complain about street parking.

I live on Valleyview Place and the street parking is ridiculous because of all the renters. I don’t know how the garbage truck or snow plow can even make it up the street when cars are parked on both sides. Valleyview Place is a cul-de-sac and supposedly cul-de-sacs are off limits for secondary suites. My guess is that a third of the homes on our street have suites. Please enforce existing rules before making new ones!

Without rental suites to help with mortgage payments, young adults and families won’t be able to afford homes in this city.

Every suite should be inspected. And should conform to all by laws. Things like garbage pickup and other services should face additional fees

The parking requirements at present are totally discriminatory. It is the size of the house and the services offered to families be the main consideration

No unlicensed suites anywhere please. When people are required to have a permit/licence they are more accountable.
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Re: property tax: this is NOT an incentive for home owners to build a suite. I think a rebate would help that issue, as well as perhaps a discount on the regular costs, like building permits.
Re: cost: the only way people are going to rent these suites is if they are cheaper to rent than other rentals and have the same advantages.
Re: Poor housing: when it comes to any housing its costly for everyone involved. Disabled, low income families, seniors, etc. These people are struggling already to find decent affordable living quarters. Don’t even bother with it if they are not going to be affordable.
Re: newcomers: I hear those that just move here appalled at the cost of rental units, let alone the cost of buying a home. In my opinion a rental tax rebate or tax reduction (which would need to be approved by the province, of course) would help those looking for housing as well.

Garden suites can help increase the rental pool but don’t provide great parking solutions for extra renter’s vehicles. On-property parking takes away from green space and quality of the lot. I think carriage suites should be given more consideration for certain areas of town as they help resolve parking while providing secondary suites.

We buy houses in neighbourhoods. I didn’t buy in a complex or apartment. Be respectful of homeowners and their rights too!! I pay taxes too!! Don’t change the character of areas where we bought. Don’t increase noise, parking and congestion. If I wanted that, I’d move to Vancouver!! Drive along Gleneagles and see how bad parking, noise and congestion is now due to rental properties, mostly illegal. I wouldn’t want my kids riding their bikes out now too. Or how would you like a carriage house built in your neighbour’s yard, only for it to peer down into your once private yard?!?! Decreased property value for that poor home. Not right city of KAMLOOPS.

Mandatory for home owners thinking of putting a secondary suite in to provide off-street parking for renters and have it enforced by the City By-laws Department. Home owners that need to house an aging parent or related family member/student be allowed to do so but when it is no longer needed, the suite reverts - put a condition on the title. I think a better way to tackle more rental occupancy inside the Urban Core is to allow carriage houses with off-street parking.

This is a no-brainer. And when you create the rules, be realistic about the way people live. Eventually, okay not yet, but eventually, there must be some way to manage the parking issue on the assumption that an increasing number of people will not own vehicles. Now let’s get this done!!!

Given how few new building lots are available in town, the opportunity to build garden suites without rezoning is a welcome prospect.

When you have unruly renters (such as cannabis user, noisy, messy, damage to suites and no respect for the neighbors; also doing mechanical work on the property along with many other issues. It is very difficult to get them out and very expensive as I have learned from others.

How do I know that my survey was sent, since I did not get a respond that it was received?

I’m not sure how to tell which suites are legal and which are not, what about Air BN Bs being used from suites, how are we supposed know if they are legal?

Public transportation is a Big issue in this city. Keep the suites downtown or tru area only and focus on transit at the same time targeting those areas.
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There needs to be consideration of people parking in front of driveways. Possibly even a limit of how many vehicles a household can have, and to have its suite included to mitigate the issue. Three vehicles parked on the street in a row mess up plowing in the winter and sometimes block driveways. As well, a possible limit on how many animals a household with a suite can have. Three dogs plus two cats, for example in one property and its suite sounds outrageous, and yet it happens. It is an issue of sanitation that is not often considered, as well as an issue of neighbours’ sanity.

Please consider street parking when making a decision. A home on our street has tenants and every night they park 4 to 8 vehicles on the street as there is only one off street parking site at the home. This makes it difficult for neighbors to park in front of their own house - and some of these neighbors are elderly. I realize the street is public and anyone can park there but 4 to 8 every night is ridiculous. There should be a limit on how many vehicles one house can park on the street.

There are many illegal suites currently in Kamloops. The rules are not being enforced except by complaints from neighbours which does not work as it pits neighbours against neighbours. How will New changes be enforced? What happens with existing illegal suites?

Suites provide affordable housing for people with low paying jobs. Under proper conditions, suites should be allowed as long as they do not affect the quality of living in the neighbourhood and that proper parking is provided for tenants so as to not affect the adjacent properties.

I live in an area where there are rentals. The only residences with which there are problems are rentals.

Our streets are already filled with cars parking and they are parking as close to the corners as possible. For example, the City allowed condos to be built on the corner of Howe and Harrison Way. If you want to go left at the top of Harrison Way, you can’t see oncoming traffic on Howe as the cars are only about 3 feet away from the corners. If we have additional suites in this area, they won’t even find a parking spot.

People should be allowed to have/build suites and use their personal property as they wish.

In suites are done in a careful, tasteful way that the City of Kamloops controls, I feel it could be a good thing for the city.

I think there should be a limited number of carriage suites as they can result in neighborhoods feeling overcrowded with two storey buildings and obstructing views of neighbours.

People shouldn’t be banking on a suite to ensure they can pay their mortgage. Proper parking needs to be available - street parking only is not acceptable. Dallas is NOT urban.

Garden suites should be slowly introduced. They will see more of a physical change to the neighbourhood. A trial should occur in the urban core prior to expanding to all urban areas of the city.

The fact is that suites exist throughout the whole city. We have one in our home and went through a rezoning and building permit to do so. It is a little disappointing knowing that our neighbours have them with no consequence. We have protected our investment by following the rules. However, I think clear guidelines and follow up should be in place for those that still choose to not comply should suites be permitted in urban areas.

Parking on the street will inevitably happen (guests and the reality of multiple cars in a household). A review of streets that prohibit on-street parking should take place to determine the impact that this will have on the neighbourhood.

As long as the city doesn’t use this as another cash grab. It must be made affordable for all.
Comments (Continued)

I am seriously moving away from owning rentals because government regulation is unfair. Any other business would be excluded from this interference. Landlords should not be expected to contribute to solving the homeless and affordability problems any more than anyone else.

I think suites are suitable for very small families or singles only

If homeowners must pay additional fees/taxes for permission to have a suite, the city needs to use that money to ensure water, sewer and roads are maintained / upgraded sufficiently for the neighbourhood.

With some guidelines in place, such as parking and density considerations, suites are an excellent way to address many housing issues

Regulation of off street parking doesn’t work, it’s not monitored. Unless bylaw wants an increase in complaints this will just crowd streets

I don’t understand why carriage suites are singled out for an additional process. My neighbourhood is evolving with renovating houses and demolishing to build new. Some of the new houses don’t fit the form and character of the neighbourhood with huge massive house beside tiny houses. By not allowing carriage suites promotes huge houses and large driveways. Carriage suites allow parking and living space on the same footprint. I love my street as it has no fronting driveways; only alley access. I want to keep that character of my neighborhood over the long term and protect/encourage landscaping. Pushing Garden Suites causes people to pave more of their lot and encourages fronting driveways. I don’t want garage doors to be the predominant feature of my street like many others. A carriage suite promotes better use of land (less paving) and renovating houses (rather than demolishing and building new). We need to promote that to meet our sustainability goals as a community. If you are going to allow secondary suites all forms should be treated equally.

I think if someone wants to go to the trouble of building another building or modifying their home to allow a rental unit I have no problem with that providing it is done properly and looks good. We do still need some green space however so sizes should be limited for sure. I do worry about the schools in certain areas of the city getting more overcrowded and with parking in certain areas becoming even harder to find it we do need some sort of potential solutions to the lack of rental spaces available in this city.

Some neighbourhood schools are bursting. This should be taken into consideration by council before allowing more ‘densification’.

Please ensure with regulations that off street parking, traffic issues and school densification are considered when permitting suites. The schools are overflowing already, and on street parking affects traffic flow, snow clearing and pedestrian traffic.

The streets are already packed. To buy a home with a suite zoning costs additional money. Will you reimburse people who paid extra for a zoned lot??

Parking in Kamloops already has its issues in certain neighbourhoods. With many individuals owning mobile homes and multiple vehicles it can be very frustrating to not have parking near your own house. By opening up suites it could ruin neighbourhood character and cause friction in the neighbourhood if there are renter issues. Also in winter there are huge parking problems on the Kamloops side roads and if a certain street had a high percentage of suites this would cause havoc with parking.

I am in favour of in-law suites/garden houses but not suites built simply to generate income. The current tenancy act favors renters: landlords have few means to deal with unsavory tenants. Meanwhile damage to neighbourhood fabric is done. Already dealing with street congestion from existing secondary suites as many nearby homes have them and they are not all well-built. The houses in my neighbourhood were not meant to be townhomes or apartment blocks!
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Working as a REALTOR® in the city, I see the impact that homes with suites have. Being able to retrofit a home that was built in the 1950’s, 1960’s or even a heritage home is so cost prohibitive to meet code standards that we see the suites being put in without permits. This is, in my view lost earnings that the city could be making and also supervising that they are constructed or modified safely for occupancy. I have seen some suites that should not be allowed to have occupancy. The clients that are coming to me, want to live in a home with a suite to help offset their cost of a mortgage and they, for the most part want them to be legal. There are obvious drawbacks to making illegal suites, legal (or changing zoning to allow them) but there are SOOOOO many of them. It would be nice to know that the illegal suites could be allowable if the zoning changed. If the codes weren’t so cost prohibitive and make some concessions to retrofit a home that wasn’t necessarily built to accommodate a suite but would still be feasible this would make an impact and allow the city to increase earnings on permits. As a side note, I did have a client last year, coming from Calgary, ask to specifically live downtown under $525,000 and wanted a LEGAL SUITE. I’m not sure of your reaction to that, but they ended up buying a home that was downtown without a suite. Just a note to mention that people are moving here from other areas and are asking specifically for legal suites. It would be nice to create a shift and change the perception of illegal suites from the city’s black sheep to a normal part of home ownership. I would like to provide my clients with the option to have a suite if they buy a home that could potentially allow it under zoning changes. This is a big request from many people that I see working day in and day out showing homes and going through the City’s zoning information. I reference the zoning page through the property information reports constantly (thank you for those links by the way) and people are asking, even if the homes don’t have a suite, would we be allowed to put one in? I may be pushing the envelope a bit, I’d like to ask the city for consideration of homes that have suites and can provide proof that the work was done properly and could meet modified standards to allow or permit the suites that are already in place. A BIG thank you to all the city staff taking time to review these standards and potentially making these changes more affordable and less cumbersome for the average home owner!

All suites, legal zoned or not, should be made public to the houses around them and city should inspect for proper build and safety issues. Many suites do not have proper window sizes or heating systems or electrical.

I think it is wise to increase density.

In Westsyde, the practice of allowing owners to gravel the city boulevard for use as a storage site for recreational vehicles, boat trailers, cars, trucks and utility trailers is allowed. Adding suites will increase the amount of gravelled boulevards. On a street without a sidewalk or curb this can be easily done. Sometimes vehicles are stacked two deep with as many as 7 vehicles on the city boulevard. For examples, look at Lyne Road and Schubert Road where there are 6-10 gravelled boulevard parking lots on city property. This also destroys green space, such as lawns, hedges, and trees which were formally a calming influence on the street and They were also a significant wild bird habitat. There needs to be a covenant when a suite is allowed that prevents graveling the city owned boulevard and turning it into a storage yard for vehicles.

Stupid idea! Families don’t need suites to live together. Why degrade quality of life of single family areas. More so called progressive taking from families. Drop it!

Nothing brings down a neighbourhood more than suites. Remove the building height limits in town and you will see contractors developing large apartments downtown thus providing more housing and maybe some actual quality businesses in the downtown this city has went backwards for years and you’re doing the same crap.

I have seen how sensitive infill of carriage and garden homes and suites works well in Burnaby Heights. I understand that in Burnaby Heights carriage and garden homes must have parking available on the property. I live near KSS, Sagebrush Theatre, Kamloops School of the Arts and Lloyd George Elementary. Parking and traffic can be a challenge in this area at times. I am all for suite development but parking and traffic are big concerns for me.
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Maybe work on developing the downtown before you lose the soul of the city which your plans have been doing for years. Suites will bring down the quality of neighbourhoods with lower class renters.

I live in Westsyde and most lots are huge. They could easily fit secondary suites in the homes plus a carriage house in the yard, plus a tiny home trailer in the parking lot. It is time to create multiple ways for people to create and live in affordable housing. Not everyone can own the home & lot, but a few more people could certainly share the amenities. All the parking lots in Westsyde are filled with extra cars, boats, and RVs anyway. I look forward to better management of those dead spaces which house only defunct vehicles, gravel, or weeds. Cheers & thanks for helping Kamloops grow in positive ways! PS Westsyde Oak Hills also needs sidewalks, and curbs one of these days :)

Concerns regarding garden and carriage suites: Neighbourhood appearance with increased buildings and increased heat due to reduced greenspace.

Suites can create bylaw issues. Currently bylaw infractions are not being addressed, especially noise issues.

If suites are not allowed, I will be forced to sell our family home when my mother passes away. With a suite allowed, I will be able to keep the house in the family for another generation. This is an important issue for my future plans. Thank you for your earliest vote on this item.

I think there should be a change in the laws around what defines a suite. I was told by a reliable source that a space is considered a suite if it a) has a full sized fridge (i.e. above the height of the counter) and b) has a stove. I have my parents living in my basement suite. It is a suite because of the fridge and stove but in every other way, it is not a suite. There are no locking doors between us. We share a furnace, hot water tanks, electrical panel, water meter, gas, hydro etc.. We are basically roommates except my mom has her own fridge and stove. I wish that this was not considered a suite...just a house with two kitchens.

I think suites allow the increasing # of people who cannot and perhaps never afford their own home and opportunity to experience a 'home' with a yard, garden, etc.

Students and single moms are living in unhealthy suites. Making it legal will provide standards and enhance Kamloops livability for all.

Allowing secondary suites distributed around the city in all neighbourhoods helps to prevent a student ghetto effect when affordable housing for university students is limited only to certain neighbourhoods, and provides more diversity of options, in both cost and quality, for students coming to Kamloops from outside our region. Our post-secondary institution here is a major economic driver and this rezoning will positively support that.

Increasing density through secondary suites is an excellent idea. These secondary suites should be encouraged by not demanding building permits and licenses.

The city needs to STOP allowing the development of new housing complexes in natural, undeveloped land areas (e.g., on grasslands, other ecologically sensitive areas).

The more rentals the better creating a stronger and cheaper options for renters through increased competition, as most landlords in Kamloops do not take very good care of their units.

I think that the simpler the process the more that people will buy into it. Like it or not suites exist and serve a good purpose so do not screw it up. Find a way to allow them to exist without costing everyone a fortune to do some kind of permitting or update. Use the KISS principal.

Suites of all kinds can create parking issues. I think there needs to be more thought put into where the tenant will park and how that will affect neighbors before renting.
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I don’t believe Bylaws can monitor all the cars on the street. I can’t even park in front of my house from all the renters taking up parking. Calgary each homeowner is given one parking pass for their home. It is for you to give to your company. You cannot park in front of someone’s home without their pass. If you do you will be towed. Kamloops needs a policy like that. Easier than Bylaws which could not enforce parking.

Existing illegal suites should have a simple process to become approved without the risk of being penalized or shut down. What will the process be for such dwellings/homeowners?

We purchased a 60 year old home in North Kamloops in 2017. Our plan was to completely renovate the interior of the house, construct a detached garage, and to eventually apply for rezoning to allow the construction of a garden suite, since the property fronts Heather Street at the back and is ideally suited. The garden suite would have had two off-street parking stalls and would have been wheelchair accessible. The staff at the City Buildings department told us that the City would support an application for rezoning for a carriage house or garden suite. However, we would require a variance to Bylaw No. 5-1-2001 in order to slightly increase the maximum lot coverage in order to build the garden suite. The cost associated with doing this is significant, and there was no guarantee that our application would be approved. We were told to build a carriage suite over a garage instead, which we may or may not do. It obviously would not be wheelchair accessible and would be quite intrusive, considering the main house and surrounding houses and accessory buildings are all single storey. So instead of a thoughtful, accessible, single storey rental we will likely build nothing. We were very enthusiastic about this project, but as a direct result of City of Kamloops policies, and its endless and unwieldy, Bylaws we will likely not build anything. I used to be someone who thought the permitting process for construction made a lot of sense. Now I believe that the less the City is involved with what I do on my own lot the better. I will absolutely avoid building permits in the future and will advise people to do the same.

We pay a lot of tax in Rayleigh yet it is easy to see that we are being treated shabbily by the City in regards to services and future planning especially in regards to access to and from being blocked by the CN. We need a bridge and Westsyde needs it also to avoid the parking lot called Westsyde Rd.

I understand there are a lot of unauthorized suites in the City of Kamloops. I support a change to the bylaw to permit legal suites in all areas of the City. I would suggest the City development services be cautious of over regulation of the process to gain approval. If it is too onerous, the public will continue to build unauthorized suites rather than go the legal more complicated and expensive route.

We bought and built in this area over 12 yrs ago the reason being it was a RS1 neighborhood. We have only to look one street down to see the mess illegal suites make for parking for homeowners. It is full of illegal suites and there is no parking for ambulance fire trucks and snow plows have a very difficult time getting around cars that are parked on the street as there is no place to park! As it is we have some illegal suites here that complaints to the city are met with the reply that it takes 3 neighbors to submit a written complaint to the city. This pits neighbor against neighbor, and causes much stress! The city should be more involved and helpful in these issues Parking is a huge issue! There is no parking from Nov 1st to March 1st. This is in place for good reasons. Parking would be a nightmare and I feel very strongly be a huge negative to the neighborhood.

My best 3 concerns expressed already.
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If parking is available on property for tenants of secondary suites, then suite, garden and carriage homes should be allowed. If there is room in a home for a secondary suite for an elderly family member or student then these cases should be given a permit if parking is not an issue. The more difficult it is to meet requirements for these suites the less people will go through process of legalizing them. If process is difficult, time consuming etc. suites will be created regardless and all benefits will not be realized.

I think the City will do a good job of monitoring where suites would be reasonably approved and safe for traffic flow

Homeowners have no control of their properties once you rent a suite, you lose totally your privacy with no respect, no the city contractors and investors should be building more rentals units, what is stopping it is REGULATIONS!

We need a diverse plan for more rental accommodations in our city. This would likely make it possible for young families to own a home as the rental would help them with paying their mortgage, saving for university for their children and saving for their own retirement and emergencies. When you consider how many Canadians live pay cheque to pay cheque, I believe this would alleviate some money worries and stress on families.

There needs a limit of how high rents can be in the city. The cost of rent is getting out of control.

I was denied rezoning / variance for a carriage suite because it would have been 50cm taller than my existing house. Less than a year later, my neighbour rebuilds and his new house is approx 1.5m taller than my house. The difference is he didn’t have to go through the rezoning / variance process. I am glad to see the City taking a close look at this whole process.

There seems to be a lot of rental apartments that should be available in the next year or two. That should help with the low vacancy rates

My guess, is that there are far more illegal suites right now, than known. Take those away and Kamloops would have a housing crisis, as would most major cities in B.C.

By legalizing them, perhaps we can raise more taxes to bolster up the infrastructure needed to support them.

These have very limited value. It depends who you ask. If someone can’t afford a mortgage, they shouldn’t pay it this way. One bad tenant and they lose their home. Being a landlord is far more difficult than people think and they get into it seeing all the sunshine and roses the city is blowing. Affordable housing should be planned, developed and built. Secondary suites is a lazy and extremely shoddy non-solution.

In the solving of one problem, many more are created. This is not city planning this is incompetence. I don’t know of a single city where this has occurred where people who lived in the neighbourhood before the change now think it was a good idea. It’s a money grab for the city, and it’s fundamentally a sign that the city can’t think of a way to make multi-family apartments affordable or desirable. You have acres of derelict buildings downtown, a desire to increase the density, and instead, your bright idea is to push this nonsense into neighbourhoods that were never designed or intended for this. I call you incompetent, lazy and full of theory and ignorance that belies common sense. I think you all need to get new jobs, starting with the most senior staff there.

I think the city has a need for more housing, as the population is rising annually; however, there is still a need for affordable housing. Many people simply can’t afford to pay low-average rental rates.

I would like to see more pet friendly suites, but I realize there are not enough rules to protect landlords and am also concerned about crime from unsavoury tenants (as criminal background checks are currently illegal with the rental tenancy board)

We have our daughter renting our suite. She has just sold her house and is renting temporarily. Suites do help relieve the rental shortage and if one does diligent checking of references of renters it can be a win-win.
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In Kelowna I bought a house and renovated it. The process for me to build a carriage house in the back yard was done under 3 weeks there. I know a lot of people who want to subdivide and rezone for many reasons all around Kamloops. Older couples who are retired who can’t take care of their acreage but don’t want to leave their home. Younger People trying to buy a house but can only get approved for a house with a suite. And middle-aged people whose kids went to university and want to give them their own space. In my opinion I think our rezoning application takes too long. With not enough communication of what’s really going on. I think some of the regulations and bylaws we have for rezoning/subdivision need to be looked at and adjusted accordingly. Every property is different and I don’t think one stipulation should block any possibilities of our cities growth. More Properties More taxes. More residents more money. Thank you for the survey.

Kamloops is behind in suite development and as such rentals are scarce and high priced.

To reiterate my prior concern, rental suites in Kamloops are a problem, rental suites that don’t have windows in bedrooms, or lights in rooms is an issue that makes finding acceptable places to live quite difficult. I moved my friend out of a suite 2 weeks ago that had 6 foot ceilings, 1 bedroom without a door, and she was paying $1200. Because she’s a single mom, she had to take what was available at the time.

I feel people who rent don’t always care about their neighbours. I’m so happy finally a house down from us sold and no longer is rented. They were pigs and Bylaw never enforced rules.

In this affordable housing crisis, any additional supply of rental units is helpful and welcome.

I really hope the city gains more rental spaces and we notice some stabilization in the rental market.

How about piloting a few areas first, evaluate after a time, and then make informed decisions about possible next steps.

The suites around us cause tons of problems with late night noise, and we can’t even park in front of our house. Our driveway has been blocked multiple times. We have almost no water pressure—it’s at the lowest threshold already.

The neighbourhood is much worse off surrounding those homes. One of our neighbours had more difficulty selling their house: prospective buyers said they didn’t want to live across from houses with suites.

Suites are good in that they will increase the amount of affordable rental units. Not everyone can afford the higher rental rates on brand new houses or rental apartments. One big negative impact could be on the number of full house rental properties which larger families require. It is already almost impossible to find full houses for rent, as many of the houses have already been converted to top floor, or basement only rental units. Thank you for considering the viewpoints of renters too in this survey, as well as the desires of landlords and homeowners.

Main concern is around parking. Increased street parking affects the character of the neighbourhood, creates more issues around snow removal and other city services, and can create more tension between neighbours. If bylaws would be in place to mitigate this I would support suites in all urban neighbourhoods.

The rent is too d*** high, and as long as it is safe and supported by utilities it should be legal.

I live in an area where rental units are allowed. Many difficulties in parking, noise, garbage. Also some criminal activity.

Suites negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods. I said neutral, but they could potentially impact the character of the neighborhood.
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I worry that people (local or not) will begin to buy houses as investments and rent both suites out. It almost needs to require the houses to be owner occupied. Just be mindful and think about how people with buck the system. If you require an onsite parking stall for the suite it should be used for the suite not for the owner to stop parking in their garage, etc. Think about how many people will be in these houses and ensure they are not going to create overcrowding in neighborhoods.

We need our suite to help pay for the mortgage on our first home. Getting into the market is difficult for people in our generation as housing prices are rising in this area and having a suite to rent out is a huge help. We would not be able to make ends meet without the suite and I believe many others are in this position as well.

Admittedly worried about people living on top of each other, or multiple suites in one home, like Vancouver. On the other hand would love to see more laneway units/carriage/separate units. They provide a renter with more privacy, freedom and accomplishment than basement suites.

It is poor planning to allow secondary suites in newer developments. Already, the size of the lots are more condensed and restricted. To add an additional dwelling, plus additional vehicles, where there is limited or no space, creates a congested, unsafe neighbourhood. Additionally, what means does the City have to enforce parking/bylaw infractions with regard to influx of secondary suites?

I think changing to a blanket policy for the entire city is a cowardly approach to creating a residential neighbourhood plan. It doesn’t take into consideration homeowners who desire to live in neighbourhoods without suites. It doesn’t find balance for home owners who choose to have, or not to have suites, in their neighbourhood. You can’t satisfy everyone but by designating areas in each neighbourhood you at least give home owners an option to choose where they want to invest and live, surrounded by suites and having their own mortgage helper, or in a neighbourhood without suites.

If other cities that have implemented the Policy have not rescinded due to the Parking problem, surely we can use their best solutions as well as our ideas to implement the program in Kamloops. The need for affordable housing for low income people is dire; when there are no options except certain apartments, it allows for very disruptive neighbour tenants and gives licence to Landlords to be dictatorial.

Whatever parking bylaws already exist in any given neighborhood should be adhered to by residences with suites.

My only concern is parking. If they’re going to have a sec suite or garden suite or Carriage Suite etc. they should have to provide off-street parking. If you go on to Courtenay Crescent it is crazy with the parking because every other house seems to have a sec suite.

BC Hydro has a different rate structure when one meter serves more than one self-contained residence, whether the suite is occupied or not. This would increase the rental cost. People will continue to rent illegal suites, so enforcement needs to be enhanced.

Consideration of suites should be based on available parking.

Certain areas in the city can be great. Areas like Pineview not so great as roads are narrow and it’s already a standing parking lot... fyi My next door neighbors on BOTH sides are illegal and it goes all down our street already and no parking and not even safe to drive on Ash Wynd way too many cars road severely obstructed!

Communities like Kelowna and Vancouver are already on board for allowing more suites and making it easier for the home owner. This attracts young families because it allows for affordable housing. Kamloops is behind the curve compared to other urban areas.

If this goes through it will help young families to cover some cost of mortgages and help young and seniors’ affordable housing. But city should make it easy transition, not make home owners jump through hoops.
Comments (Continued)

We need to be careful with the stereotypes regarding renters and rental suites. We partner with our wonderful, hardworking, deserving tenants who are respectful and excellent neighbours. The houses and often some of the best maintained on the street and parking is never an issue. As family dynamics and household sizes change adding inventory through suites in existing homes is critical to avoiding housing shortages.

I don’t have a suite in my home, but given the current low vacancy rate in Kamloops, I think this is a great idea. Rather than building more housing, let people use the homes they have and the space they are not using to create housing for others if they wish.

There is so much need for housing it only makes sense to make suites as easy as possible for people to rent out and rent.

What does sensitive infill mean? I answered neutral as I don’t know what the question was asking.

Should be allowed. Suites would help young families be able to get into the market with these housing prices knowing that they could rent out the basement.

I think if it is not changing dramatically then it’s okay.

For example if someone has a garage that is converted to a garden suite, it still looks the same and has little impact.

If you build a 2 storey addition in a neighbourhood it will look out of place and not suited.
I think they should be allowed as long as it makes sense in that particular part of the neighbourhood.

The biggest issue is when a tenant is causing a real issue such as drugs or other and it’s difficult to evict them. Which is why I rent to TRU Homestay only.

Changing zoning is frustrating for home owners who bought in areas that aren’t zoned for suites on purpose. We have run into several issues with tenants in illegal suites in our area. I can’t imagine what it’d be like if it was opened up to everyone.

I do have a concern about how existing ‘illegal/non-conforming’ suites would be brought into compliance with any new regulations. There are many, many suites that exist that have been ignored under current City Policy. This has resulted in many suites that are not in compliance with building codes and present potential life safety issues. There needs to be a mechanism put in place as part of this process to bring up to code and normalize these units.

I believe rental suites work for owner occupied where they are present to oversee the upkeep of the property and confirm off street parking is complied with. My concern going forward is non present investors who rent all property and have problem renters.

more suites are needed such a shortage of housing especially affordable

A huge proportion of the city’s existing rental spaces is already found in suites. Essentially Kamloops has had for decades a don’t speak don’t tell approach to suites... as long as you respect your neighbors and don’t impact them. The cost of bringing suites into compliance to meet permits and zoning standards could be exorbitant. That would require an existing owner to possibly evict existing tenants to do the work (that can be hard under the tenancy act). That would also create a potential rise in the number of renters unable to find appropriate rental suites while the city makes this transition… Which would not be quick. The amount of money that would be required to get the work done. The amount of lost income in the interim.

Renter-heavy neighborhoods in the city are generally more unsightly, Busy, Noisy, filled with the smell of tobacco and marijuana smoke. Affordable home ownership should be the goal and financial coaching to help renters understand they can do better with their cash then spending it on rent worth more than a mortgage, junk food, vehicle payments that outclass their income and pay day loans...
Comments (Continued)

Safety is obviously a concern. Parking is a major issue.

Cost of housing and general living expenses are so high that people have to be creative with the housing issues. I would rather see more suites where there is control of the people living in them rather than multi-family apartment buildings.

The reason that I am neutral about suites creating parking issues is that suite might cause parking issues but they don’t have to if there is reasonable approach to off street vs on street parking. I believe that allowing a balance of parking on street and off should make suites available and acceptable.

The only areas where it would be an issue having suites is in cul-de-sacs. Parking is already limited there and sometimes can be an issue. I guess city has to make sure the home has sufficient parking for at least 2 or 3 vehicles.

If carefully planned, suites can be a positive addition to a home.

More suites! The city needs to incentivise suites and promote density throughout Kamloops. Down with subdivisions, up with density!

More suites! The city needs to incentivise suites and promote density throughout Kamloops. Down with subdivisions, up with density!

In my neighbourhood suites have created parking lots in single family houses. Renters generally have 2 vehicles. A work vehicle and a personal vehicle, or 2 vehicles for 2 people.

1. Housing costs are driving homeowners to downsize. Keeping current housing owners in place by allowing mortgage helpers is a good idea.
2. I would have my university student rent from me as well as aging parent if secondary suite were permitted.

I think allowing residences to have suites is a HUGE benefit to both owner and renters. Some owners are retired and don’t really want to move, but home is too big for one person, therefore, having a suite, owner can stay in home and not have to look after all of it all the time lol. As for parking, I feels it is up to the owner to provide parking for renter - not for renter to wander neighborhood looking for a space. To me, this a common courtesy thing.
APPENDIX D

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

How do you define a secondary suite?

A secondary suite is defined as a second dwelling unit that has a total floor area of not more than 90 m² and floor space that is less than 40% of the habitable floor space of the principal building. The suite must be located within the principal building either above or below ground.

How do you define a garden or carriage suite, and what’s the difference between the two?

A garden suite is a self-contained, one-storey dwelling unit that is separate from, subordinate in size to, and accessory to the principal dwelling. The total floor area of a garden suite can be no more than 80 m².

A carriage suite is a self-contained, two-storey dwelling unit that is separate from, subordinate in size to, and accessory to the principal dwelling. The footprint of carriage suite can be no greater than 80 m² and cannot have more than 95 m² of residential living space.

Where are secondary suites currently allowed?

Secondary suites are currently a permitted use in the RS-1S, RT-1, RT-2, and RT-3 urban residential zones; the RC-2 and RM-2A (subject to RT-1 regulations) multi-family zones; and the CD-1 (Orchards Walk) and CD-5 (West Highlands) comprehensive development zones. The City will only permit suites on lots with a single-family home and no other dwelling units (except in the RC-2 zone) with a minimum lot area of 464 m². Other regulations that need to be met for a suite to be considered include those pertaining to lot width, street frontage, setbacks, off-street parking, and front yard landscaping.

Where are garden and carriage suites currently allowed?

Garden suites (one-storey accessory residential dwellings) and carriage suites (two-storey accessory residential dwellings) are currently permitted on lots with single-family homes and no other dwelling units in the RS-1S urban residential zone. Garden suites will only be considered on corner lots, lots with lane access, or double-fronting lots with a minimum lot area of 464 m². Other regulations that need to be met for a suite to be considered include those pertaining to lot width, street frontage, setbacks, off-street parking, and front yard landscaping. If the lot area is a minimum of 650 m² with a minimum of 18 m of frontage and a 4.5 m side yard setback, secondary access is not required. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area guidelines within the OCP (KAMPLAN).
What do I need to do to construct a legal suite?
Secondary suites are regulated under the BC Building Code. A legal secondary suite is one that complies with regulations within the City’s Zoning Bylaw and that has been constructed under a valid Building Permit. Building Permit applications for a secondary suite need to include the following:

- completed Building Permit application
- construction value for the work, including materials and labour
- site plan showing:
  - parking provisions for the additional dwelling unit
  - access (stairs) to the secondary suite
- scaled floor plans showing:
  - overall floor plans for the existing building with dimensions
  - fire separation location, rating, and construction details
  - heating and ventilation details
  - suite layout showing (with dimensions) room uses, door sizes and swing, bedrooms, etc.
  - bedroom window sizes, including location and dimensions of window wells
  - smoke alarm locations and type
  - mechanical room location and separation

Can I strata title or subdivide my suite?
The suite and principal dwelling are a single real estate entity, and the suite cannot be strata titled.

Do I have to pay Development Cost Charges (DCCs) for my secondary suite?
Development Cost Charges (DCCs) for homes are charged on a square metre basis, and no additional DCCs are payable for the construction of a secondary suite.

I live in a suburban or rural neighbourhood (Barnhartvale, Heffley Creek, Knutsford, Noble Creek, Rayleigh, Rose Hill). Will the City consider allowing suites in my area?
The recently updated Official Community Plan (KAMPLAN) focuses growth in walkable, urban areas with access to transit, service, and amenities. The City is also not considering allowing suites in suburban and rural areas as the water systems in these areas are generally not designed to handle increased density.

Why is the City not considering allowing carriage suites as a permitted use in more areas of the city?
Once a type of land use becomes a permitted use, it does not require a rezoning and public hearing process. Carriage suites are two-storey, accessory residential dwellings and have the potential to have a more significant impact on neighbourhood character than a one-storey garden suite. Additionally, carriage suites can lead to privacy concerns in the backyards of adjacent neighbours.

Carriage suites will still be considered in areas where garden suites are a permitted use. However, due to the potential impact on neighbourhood character and neighbouring properties, these housing types will continue to require a rezoning and public hearing process. The form and character of garden and carriage suites are further regulated through the Intensive Residential Development Permit Area Guidelines within the OCP (KAMPLAN).

Where can I find more information?
Residents are encouraged to consult the Zoning Bylaw or contact the City’s Development, Engineering, and Sustainability Department at 250-828-3561 for more information.