

Secondary Suites, Garage & Garden Suites Phase 2: Web Survey Summary (June 12 - July 14, 2008)

(Comparison with Phase 1 Random Telephone Survey (June 2007¹) and Phase 1 Web Survey (August 2007² in italics)

86 Survey respondents (Phase 2 Web Survey June 12-July 14, 2008)

- 36 commented on secondary suites only
- 10 commented on garage or garden suites only
- 40 responded to both

Source of affordable housing:

- 80% agreed that providing increased support and opportunities for creating new secondary suites will provide affordable, safe housing within the City of Edmonton (55 of 69 respondents).
- 72% agreed that that providing increased support and opportunities for creating new garage and garden suites will provide affordable, safe housing within the City of Edmonton (31 of 43 respondents)

Phase 1 surveys:

- *Two-thirds (66%) overall in the 2007 random telephone survey (265 of 402 respondents); [67% web (31 of 46 respondents)] agreed that providing increased support and opportunities for creating new suites will provide affordable, safe housing within the City of Edmonton.*

Homeowner support/likelihood of developing a Secondary Suite

- 70% indicated they would consider developing a secondary suite (48 of 69 respondents)
- 10% indicated they would not create a secondary suite, but it would not bother them if their neighbours did (7 of 69 respondents)
- 1 respondent already has a suite
- Total 81% combined support for Secondary Suites (56 of 69 respondents)

Phase 1 surveys:

- *9% in random survey (29 of 320 respondents); [33% web (14 of 42 respondents)] would consider developing a secondary suite*
- *45% in random survey (145 of 320 respondents); [19% web (8 of 42 respondents)] would not create a secondary suite, but it would not bother them if their neighbours did*
- *Total 54% in random survey (174 of 320 respondents); [52% web (22 of 42 respondents)] combined support*

Notes:

1. Phase 1 Random Telephone Survey: 402 Edmontonians (June 2007)
2. Phase 1 Web Survey: [(46 respondents, August 2007) in brackets, where available]

Homeowner support/likelihood of developing a Garage Suite (At and Above Grade) and Garden Suites

- 59% indicated they would consider developing a Garage or Garden Suite (26 of 44 respondents)
- 11% indicated that they would not create a Garage or Garden Suite, but it would not bother them if their neighbours did (5 of 44 respondents)
- 70% total combined support for Garage or Garden Suites (31 of 44 respondents)

Survey Respondents - Self-identification by sub-group (out total of 86 survey respondents)

- 29% participated in a Smart Choices Residential Infill Principles for Mature Areas workshop (involving Secondary, Garage & Garden Suites) in June, 2008 (24 of 84 who responded)
- 35% participated in or were invited to the Secondary Suites, Garage & Garden Suites stakeholder meeting in June, 2008 (28 of 80 who responded).
- Overlap in groups: 34 (of the total 86 respondents to survey) (40%) were in one or both of the above sub-groups (significant overlap in two groups). 18 of these respondents (21%) reported being members of both Smart Choices sub-group and the Stakeholders' sub-group
- 51 of 86 respondents (59%) reported being a member of neither sub-group (general public).
- 1 of 86 respondents did not identify themselves as being a member of either sub-group and did not specifically indicate that they belong to "neither" sub-group

Secondary Suites - Phase 2 Web Survey

Table 1: Support for Existing Regulations and Location Restrictions (Phase 1)

Regulation/Control/Use Locations (n= number answering)	Agree or Strongly Agree ¹	Disagree or Strongly Disagree ¹	Neutral ¹
Minimum site size of 360 m2 for single detached dwelling and secondary suite (n=72)	46%	25%	29%
Maximum floor area basement suite – size of first floor area of principal dwelling (n=74)	58%	20%	22%
Maximum floor area – suite developed on or above first floor – 40% of total floor area of principal dwelling, or 70 m2, whichever is less (n=75)	31%	32%	37%
Parking – min. one extra parking space for secondary suite (plus two [2] for principal dwelling) (n=75) ²	37%	51%	12%
Location Restrictions: RF1 & RF2 Zones (existing) (n=75) (see below – column 1, Table 2)	15%	79% (86% too restr. & 10% not restr. enough; n=58)	7%

Notes: 1. Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means strongly disagree, 2 means disagree, 3 means neutral (neither agree nor disagree), 4 means agree and 5 means strongly agree.

2. Additional comments (not prompted): 7 of 35 respondents indicated that parking conditions should not be required/if near transit.

Secondary Suites - Phase 2 Web Survey

Table 2: Proposed Amendments (Phase 2)

Location Options RF1 & RF2 Zones (n= number answering)	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Which option describes how Secondary Suites should be allowed in the RF1 and RF2 zones where they are not currently Permitted? (n=73) Existing location restrictions (Phase 1): a. corner lots; or b. lots fronting onto a service road; or c. lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line abuts a Site in an Industrial, Commercial, Row Housing, or Apartment Zone; or d. lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line are not separated from a Site in an Industrial, Commercial, Row Housing, or Apartment Zone by a public roadway more than 10.0 metres wide (i.e., not wider than a lane).	18% Allow as Discretionary Use where not Permitted	53% Allow as Permitted Use throughout RF1 & RF2 Zones	6% As Permitted Use in any other location, where constructed in new single detached dwelling	12% No increase in existing locations	11% None of above

Garage Suites – Above Grade - Phase 2 Web Survey

Table 1: Support for Existing Regulations and Location Restrictions (Phase 1)

(n= number answering)

Regulation/Control/Locations (n=number of respondents answering)	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Neutral
Minimum site size of 460 m2 for single detached dwelling and garage suite (n=47)	40%	38%	21%
Maximum floor area garage suite – 60 m2 (over-sized double garage) (n=48)	36%	46% [55% too small; 5% too large; n=22]	19%
Maximum height: 6 m or height of dwelling, whichever is less (n=48)	31%	52% [68% too low; 20% too high; n=25]	17%
Privacy Regulations (n=47 to 48)			
a. Off-set windows to limit overlook into neighbouring yards & windows	65%	8%	27%
b. Balconies limited to face lane or flanking roadway	55%	34%	11%
c. Larger windows should face lane or flanking roadway	52%	18%	29%
d. Roof top decks on Garage Suites should be prohibited	50%	38%	13%
Location Restrictions: RF1, RF2, RF3 Zones (n=47). Existing location restrictions (Phase 1):	19%	77% (78% too restr. & 14% not restr. Enough; n=36)	4%
a. corner lots; or			
b. lots fronting onto a service road; or			
c. lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line abuts a Site in an Industrial, Commercial, Row Housing, or Apartment Zone; or			
d. lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line are not separated from a Site in an Industrial, Commercial, Row Housing, or Apartment Zone by a public roadway more than 10.0 metres wide (i.e., not wider than a lane).			

Garage Suites – Above Grade - Phase 2 Web Survey

Table 2: Proposed Amendments (Phase 2)

Location Options RF1, RF2 & RF3 Zones (n= number answering)	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Locations: RF1, RF2 & RF3 Zones – options to change (n=44) Which option best describes where Garage Suites should be allowed?	21% Retain current location restrictions (see Table 1, bottom of column 1, previous page, for list)	46% Remove location restrictions. Allow as Discretionary Use throughout the zones	34% Modify location restrictions in one or more way (see below) ¹

Note:

- Proposed Option 3 included listed location restrictions, plus suggestions as volunteered by respondents, with support for each as follows:
 - adding lots backing onto a lane adjacent to an arterial road that is separated from the lane by a landscaped boulevard (6 respondents)
 - removing opportunity on lots adjacent to a commercial or industrial zone (2 respondents)
 - opposed to garage suites (2 respondents)
 - remove as many restrictions as possible (2 respondents)
 - allow discretionary use of garage suites for all zones (1 respondent)
 - allow garage suites everywhere (1 respondent)
 - allow garage suites in any house in RF1 or RF2 zone (2 respondent)
 - location restrictions should be changed to permitted use (1 respondent)

Garage Suites – At Grade & Garden Suites NEW USES - Phase 2 Web Survey

Table 1: Support for Proposed Regulations and Location Restrictions (Phase 2)

Regulation/Control/Locations (n= number answering)	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Neutral
Minimum site size of 525 m ² for single detached dwelling and garage suite – at grade or garden suite (n=46)	35%	33%	33%
Minimum site (lot) width – 15 m (n=44)	30%	39%	32%
Maximum floor area garage suite – 50 m ² (same as a double garage) (n=48)	42%	42% [58% too small; 16% too large; n=19]	17%
Site Coverage: where a garage suite – at grade, or garden suite is developed, it may exceed accessory building site coverage regulation (provided total for the site does not exceed existing maximum as set in each zone) (n=47)	26%	43%	32%
Maximum height: 4.3 m (n=45)	40%	22%	38%
Locations: RF1, RF2 & RF3 Zones (n=47)	47% Allow as Discretionary Use throughout the zones (no location restrictions)	26% In proposed locations only (see below) ¹	28% Other
Location Restrictions: Other zones (proposed – see below) (see below) ¹ (n=47)	53% Allow as Discretionary Use throughout the zones	19% In proposed locations only	28% Other

Note:

1. Proposed OPTION for location restrictions for Garage Suites – At Grade & Garden Suites (column 3 above):
 - a. corner lots; or
 - b. lots fronting onto a service road; or
 - c. lots backing onto a lane adjacent to an arterial road that is separated from the lane by a landscaped boulevard; or
 - d. lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line abuts a Site in a Row Housing or Apartment Zone; or
lots where a Side or Rear Lot Line are not separated from a Site in a Row Housing or Apartment Zone by a public roadway more than 10.0 metres wide (i.e., not wider than a lane).

FINAL COMMENTS: 10% of respondents or more (un-prompted)

Additional Comments Regarding Secondary Suites, Garage Suites or Garden Suites	
	Percent of Respondents* (n=40 respondents)
Is a good solution to affordable housing	33%
Need less restrictions / need to make it easier	18%
Will destroy single family communities	13%
Rent from suites will help many households / seniors	10%
Shouldn't restrict areas due to lack of parking / parking shouldn't be an issue	10%