



MEMORANDUM

TO: CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
FROM: BRIGID REYNOLDS, CONSULTING TOWN PLANNER
SUBJECT: TRADITIONAL URBAN – R-3 ZONE
MEETING DATE: DECEMBER 9, 2025

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present Zoning Bylaw Amendment No. 1124 to amend the Traditional Urban (R-3) and Medium Density (R-4) zone districts, specifically Section 5.1.6 f. i) minimum front lot line setbacks for principal dwelling units and accessory buildings or structures.

Background

Bill 44 Housing Statutes (Residential Development) Amendment Act, 2023 permits one secondary suite or one accessory dwelling units in all communities in B.C. and requires bylaws in municipalities, with more than 5,000 people and within an urban containment boundary, to allow for:

- three to four units on lots zoned for single-family or duplex use
- six units on larger lots zoned for single family or duplex use, close to frequent-service transit stops.

While the Town is not subject to these provisions, under the CMHC-HAF grant, the Town voluntarily offered to undertake a review and increase density on most of the single-family zone districts.

On November 24, 2024, Council approved Zoning Amendment Bylaw 1110 to increase density on single family zone districts by permitting duplexes in the Urban R-2 zone district and permitting triplex and quadplex type dwellings in the Traditional Urban R-3 zone district. The zoning amendment included changes to regulations for minimum lot size, maximum height,

maximum lot coverage, front, rear and side yard setbacks to enable the siting of multiple dwelling units on a lot.

Zoning Bylaw Section 5.1.6 f. i) amended the front yard setback from 7.5 m to 6.1m to garage face; 4.5m to front face of dwelling and requires that the garage face must be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres further back from the front face of the dwelling. This setback applies to single detached, duplex, triplex, and quadplex dwellings. For townhouses the dwelling unit and/or garage must be setback 4.5 m from the front lot line and front porches may extend into the setback.

In the spring 2025, building permit application reviews determined that some proposed single family dwelling units did not meet the new setback. The owners and/or builders were informed that they must either comply with the new setbacks or apply for a variance. As a result, three variances were granted to allow construction to allow the 7.5 m to the front face of the dwelling and/or garage and eliminate the 1.5 m setback between the front face of the dwelling and garage. The correspondence received from those variances are in Attachment 1.

Following Council's consideration of these variances, at its regular meeting on May 27, 2025 Council adopted the following motion:

that staff be directed to provide alternative amendments to the Zoning Bylaw for consideration by Council to allow for the standards for single detached and duplex dwellings in the Traditional Urban R-3 zone to be similar to the regulations that existed prior to the November 24, 2024 Zoning Bylaw Amendments.

Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1124 is intended to respond to Council's direction.

DISCUSSION

Setbacks

Lesser front yard setbacks accomplish two goals. Bringing buildings closer to the sidewalk creates more vibrant streets by increasing the likelihood of social interactions and invites more 'eyes on the street' effect. It also allows more space for additional units to be build on the property. However, reducing front yard setbacks for both the dwelling unit and garage can reduce the length of the driveway length which and reduce or eliminate on-site parking spaces. Therefore, a larger setback for garages is warranted.

Some of the development variance permit applicants did not support the requirement that the front face of the garage must be setback 1.5 m behind the front face of the dwelling unit. But they did not object to the 6.1 m setback.

The proposed amendment eliminates the requirement for the front face of the garage to be behind the front face of the dwelling but does provide this 'separation' as an option. The garage must in all cases be 6.1 m from the front property line to ensure adequate depth for cars.

The amendments would apply to single detached, duplex, triplex and quadplex units the Traditional Urban (R-3) and Medium Density (R-40) zone districts.

No additional inquiries have been received since the variance applications were considered by Council at its May meeting.

Additional Minor Amendments

The draft bylaw no. 1124 includes some minor formatting amendments to improve the readability of the table in Section 5.1.6 Standards. None of these amendments are substantive.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

At its regular meeting on April 24, 2025 the APC received presentations from builders affected by the new setbacks and discussed the matter. The Commission recommended to Council (APC 14/25) that individuals be required to make application for a Development Variance Permit for their specific circumstances. And at its regular meeting of September 18, 2025, the Commission suggested that the proposed amendment bylaw be sent to local builders for their comments.

IMPLICATIONS

a. Financial:

This is a Council directed amendment, so no application fees are paid.

b. Policy/Legislation:

The original zoning bylaw amendments were facilitated to implement Bill 44 to enable more units on single family zoned lots by reducing the front yard setback. The proposed amendment does not reduce the potential to enable more units to be constructed.

c. Strategic Priority:

N/A

d. Sustainability:

N/A

e. Communication:

As required by the Local Government Act, zoning bylaw amendments are required to receive 3 readings and final adoption. Public hearings are now prohibited if a proposed zoning bylaw is consistent with the Official Community Plan and it's for residential uses. Notice of the intent to consider 1st reading of the zoning amendment bylaw is required and must be provided 10 days prior to Council's consideration.

In addition to the statutory notice, Bylaw no. 1109 requires a notice be posted on the Town's website, on Facebook, and at the Town Hall. The APC suggested that local area builders be informed of the proposed amendment to receive their input. The proposed

amendment appears to address concerns raised by builders and provides flexibility for construction the contract planner doesn't recommend seeking feedback.

f. Staffing Implication:

Preparing the draft amendment bylaw and staff report has required approximately 20 hours of the contract planner's time including discussions at APC. An additional, 7 hours staff time for the contract planner and executive assistant, is estimated to complete the zoning amendment process.

CONCLUSION

The Town has heard concerns related to the recent amendments to the Traditional Urban (R-3) zone related to setbacks. The proposed amendment provides flexibility so builders have the choice to build to the old setback of 7.5 m or they can build to the 4.5 m setback for the front face of the dwelling providing the garage is setback 6.1 m from the front line which will ensure there is adequate depth for vehicles.

OPTIONS

- 1) Direct staff to send the draft bylaw to local area builders to seek input and provide Council with the feedback.
- 2) Direct staff to prepare and send out notice of 1st reading for Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1124 as required by Bylaw No. 1109.
- 3) Direct staff to amend Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1124 [provide direction for amendments].

RECOMMENDATION

The contract planner recommends Option 2, to prepare and send out notice of 1st reading for Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1124 as required by the Local Government Act and Bylaw No. 1109.

Signed

Brigid Reynolds

Concurrence:

John T

John Thomas

Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment 1

Correspondence Received Regarding R-3 Zone District

From: Bill McGowan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Building Inspections <inspections@lakecowichan.ca>
Subject: Zoning changes

Subject: Request for Consideration to Amend 1.5m Garage Setback Requirement – Trails Edge, Lake Cowichan

Dear Alex,

I'm reaching out regarding the recent zoning bylaw amendment requiring a 1.5-metre setback for garages from the front of the home in the Town of Lake Cowichan.

Two of my clients recently purchased building lots in the Trails Edge development. The first had their building plans reviewed and approved by the developer, and subsequently removed all conditions based on that approval. The second, who is also the builder for the first client, purchased another lot in the same development just yesterday with an **unconditional offer**, relying on the understanding that the original approved plans would also be acceptable for his build.

Unfortunately, it was only after this second purchase that I was made aware — through the listing agent — of the bylaw change that came into effect last November. This setback requirement had not been communicated to the developers and had not been noticed during the plan approvals. It's now creating significant uncertainty for my clients, despite their having acted in good faith based on information available at the time of their purchases.

Given that other new homes in the area were not subject to this requirement, and that the change originated under a previous staff member who is no longer with the Town, I respectfully ask that the Town consider amending or repealing this particular setback requirement. From both a practical and planning perspective, it seems to be inconsistent with past approvals and was not communicated in a way that allowed developers, builders, or purchasers to account for it.

I've been advised by Jennifer Allen of RE/MAX Generation that you are also open to reconsidering this bylaw, and I truly appreciate your time and attention in reviewing this matter.

Please let me know if further information is needed, and I look forward to hearing from you.
Kind regards,

Bill McGowan
RE/MAX Island Properties

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: john main [REDACTED] m>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 9:55 AM
To: Building Inspections <inspections@lakecowichan.ca>
Subject: New housing requirements

To who this may concern,

My name is John Main and I am writing to you today to voice my concerns about the new local by-law changes that have been put in place by the Town of Lake Cowichan. I am a local Business owner, Builder and Developer. My framing company has also framed a big portion of the new construction in the town the last 10 years. We have worked in all the current and existing subdivisions within the town. Our relationship with the town and building department to date has been fantastic. I would guess we have framed 30 houses in this area in the last few years alone. Looking back at all of them we have only had one house that would pass with these new guidelines. This special house was also built on an irregular shaped lot and designed to fit that lot only.

I own property and I have been working on plans for a new build only to find out this change when I went in for permitting, there is no way to redesign this house and I spent 2700\$ on these plans. I was wondering why we did not have a chance to vote on or discuss these new guidelines?

I would like to have some clarification on who made these new changes and some answers or reasoning to back them up, also why no one in the building community was notified before this happened. I strongly believe that this will be a detriment to the building community.

I have been working with the developers of Elk Rd and have done all the framing and concrete work thus far. We were booked in to start framing 2 more of these affordable duplex's next month only to have this stop us dead in our tracks. In a time of uncertainty it couldn't have come at a worse time for local builders and family's who need local jobs and housing. We are trying our best to build a product that does just that.

If there is a time we could all get together and have a meeting I would be happy to sit down and chat about how this negatively affects everyone from the start to finish. I believe as local tax payers we have a right to know.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

John Main
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Beachrock Construction <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 7:42 AM

To: Building Inspections <inspections@lakecowichan.ca>

Subject: R3 Zoning amendment

Good morning Alex,

We are writing you this morning in regards to R3 zoning amendment.

We wanted to bring up an idea to see if this could be worked into city planning.

As I understand it, the front setback for R3 is 4.5m with residential facade having to be 6.5m in front of garage.

Instead of mandating that all garages be recessed back from front of house, it might make more sense to make it so that the setback can be reduced to 4.5m set from front lot line only if they follow these new regulations. However, if builder maintains a 7.5m set back they could still be allowed to have garage forward of residential.

This would allow for some flexibility in design options.

With the current zoning rule it will make a very large portion of available and commonly used designs unusable. Not to mention greatly reduce the design diversity in these zones. Having the garage forward of the entrance allows for better covered entrances, windbreaks, and added privacy. As builders we cannot see any benefits to this zoning regulation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Adam Ehman

Beachrock Construction

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kirk Young

Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 10:12 PM

To: Building Inspections

Subject: Setback changes

Hello Alex,

My name is Kirk Young and I have spent the past several years, and invested a significant amount of money, in creating a 10 lot subdivision on Elk Rd. The past year we have begun the process of building it out with duplexes in an attempt to provide lower cost housing for new home buyers in your town. The timing of recent building requirement changes and its application to the configuration of a duplex plan has come right in the middle of building this planned subdivision.

To my knowledge, there was no consideration to any of the builders or developers in town to ask how these changes may affect things moving forward. I am one of these developers, and I am shocked that these new regulations would be put into place with no warning to builders whatsoever.

As our subdivision has been planned out in advance, we now have to scrap the plans that have already been paid for. The new requirements will force us to postpone further construction to attempt to subscribe to these new regulations by completely changing direction in what we are allowed to build. New duplex plans will have to be created. As you know, time and redoing work adds to cost of the end product, which are intended to allow new home buyers into the market at a manageable cost.

Another way that new requirement change applies to our subdivision is one of esthetic continuity. Great consideration has been taken to have our entire subdivision look as though it was built with a plan in mind.

The new setback changes are going to create a disruption in product design, which will in turn change the continuity of the entire subdivision. In talking with Joe Fernandez in the past, I have been lead to believe that this attention to continuity is something that the town is interested in attaining.

In closing, the unforeseen requirement change will cost young homebuyers in your town a great deal more for a similar product that they could purchased yesterday. It is going against the towns interest of having new subdivisions built with pleasing esthetics. And, it will make further developments and building new homes in your community much more difficult in a time when governments are striving to do the opposite.

Thanks for your attention. I am available for further discussion if needed.

Sincerely, Kirk Young

From: Don Raymond [REDACTED] >
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 9:13 PM
To: Building Inspections <inspections@lakecowichan.ca>
Cc: Kirk Young [REDACTED] >
Subject: New set back rules

Hey Alex, I just wanted to let you know how these new rules is affecting my construction projects , just lost a presale duplex on my Elk rd subdivision because of the new rules, I have a customer who bought a lot in Trails edge and had picked a plan and they are on a very tight budget and these new rules will cost more than they can afford.. the duplexes I build are low income housing and are affordable housing for first time buyers but these changes will increase the costs approximately \$20,000.00+ per side.. these changes are making my duplex's unaffordable for lower income families and first time buyers. Just trying to design a duplex, house under these new rules is very difficult and costly. I'm hoping the town of lake Cowichan can come to their senses and remove this change to the building code.

Sent from Don Raymond's iPhone

From: Ryan Whitaker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:32 PM
To: Building Inspections <inspections@lakecowichan.ca>
Subject: new zoning rule about garages

I am writing this email to relay my frustrations and probably many others with the new R3 zoning requirements that say a garage has to be setback 1.5 meters from the front of the house. This sudden change in rules is coming out of nowhere and if it stands will cause me and others massive financial loss and put me out of work for months. The rule itself makes no sense taking away the choice of designing your house in an economical way that makes sense for the lot that you have acquired. Narrow lots like the ones in Trails Edge limit your design already implementing this makes it a lot harder. I would also add that it doesn't make sense to enforce considering 90% of the existing homes are already built the opposite way.

I own lot 10, 146 Maplewood Rise. I had my final plans done on november 22 2024, to the bylaws that stood in place at that time! Then I was told to get them engineered and I did. Now today when i finally have all the many pieces required to apply for my building permit. I am told that the rules have now changed! I was taken away. I have spent months getting this all ready and the engineering has already put us behind schedule by a month. If you are going to implement a new rule like this there has to be grace period involved of at least 6 months because of the slow nature of building and gathering the requirements needed. IF this new rule stands I will be needing to redesign my whole house plan, re price, have all the contractors re price. have a new energy advisor consultation, new vent letter. Pay for a new plan and pay for new engineering on that new plan. This will cost me 15,000\$ at least. Am I just supposed to throw out the 15,000\$ dollars that I've already spent? Nevermind that me and my partner will be out of work for three months for new plans, new engineering and then waiting for a building permit.

This is unacceptable and life altering for me and my wife please reconsider and at least introduce a grace period or an exemption.

-Ryan and Lauren Whitaker

Date: April 15, 2025

To: Planning and Development Department

Town of Lake Cowichan

P.O. Box 860 Lake Cowichan, BC V0R 2G0

Subject: Concern Regarding New Front Yard Setback Clause for Attached Garages

Dear Planning and Development Department,

I am writing on behalf of [Company Name], a residential developer currently working on a new housing development within the Town of Lake Cowichan. We are reaching out to formally express our concern regarding a recently introduced clause to the front yard setback regulations, which stipulates that an attached garage must be set a minimum of 1.5 meters behind the front face of the home.

This clause presents a significant and unexpected challenge for both our development team and our buyers. A large number of our purchasers have already secured lots and committed to home designs that feature garages either flush with or slightly in front of the main building face-designs that are

consistent with contemporary architectural norms and standard across many new residential developments.

The decision to enforce a 1.5-meter garage setback not only contradicts the approved building scheme we have established, but it also undermines the expectations of homeowners who have invested in the community with a clear understanding of the type of homes being built. This regulation appears to have been introduced without consultation, rationale, or supporting data, and as such, we find it both impractical and without merit.

We respectfully urge the Town of Lake Cowichan to reconsider and reverse this clause to better reflect the realities of current development practices and homeowner expectations. In the interim, we request that exceptions be granted for building permit applications already in process or planned within developments where such design styles have been pre-approved and marketed.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with your team to further discuss this matter and to find a solution that supports both the Town's planning goals and the integrity of ongoing developments.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, Jennifer Allen

RE/MAX® Generation

Sharon Fern – 

Good after Brigid. My husband and I purchased a lot in the new Trails End subdivision in March and had house plans drawn up off a brand new existing house in the same subdivision. We are ready to proceed with our new build in the only building window for the year only to find out about this new change to the building code which came into affect April 1/25 in Lake Cowichan. With the new setback requirements we cannot proceed with our build as planned before this new change came into effect and are losing very valuable building time in the process now that we can't afford to lose.

This new building code has many problems attached to it and there is not one positive element to it. First we all there are no plans that exist to accommodate these new setbacks, it creates a large dead useless space at the front entrance besides the enormous cost of trying to accommodate this change and for no reason other than making the front if the house look ridiculous and out of place in a subdivision that is half building under the old code.

We beg this new build code to be repealed or put on hold immediately or until the ramifications can be seriously looked at. We feel we purchased our lot and had our plans in place before this change and we should at least be allowed to move forward with our build and be grandfathered in under the old code.

If we can't move forward with our deadline and budget in place this is going to leave us homeless and broke.

Please reverse this change to the new building for many reasons. There are three new subdivisions half built in town that would now look silly with two different house styles in them.

Thank you for your consideration to change this new building code.

Thank you
Don and Sharon Fern

**TOWN OF LAKE COWICHAN
BYLAW NO. 1122-2025**

A BYLAW TO AMEND ZONING BYLAW 1055-2021

WHEREAS the *Local Government Act* authorizes a local government to enact bylaws, which would designate different zones pertaining to land use and development of the Town of Lake Cowichan;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Town of Lake Cowichan deems it expedient to amend Bylaw No. 1055-2021 to allow for changes with respect to land use and zoning regulations;

AND WHEREAS the passage of this bylaw has met all the requirements pursuant to the Local Government Act and the Community Charter;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Town of Lake Cowichan in open meeting assembled enacts the following:

1. TITLE

This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as the ‘Town of Lake Cowichan Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1125-2025.

2. AMENDMENT

Amend section 5.1.6 Standards by

a) removing Table A

Table A

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
Standards						
a. Minimum Lot Size (square metres) or lot location						

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
i. Single dwelling	600	600	600	500	350	275
ii. Duplex (two units on a single lot strata)		780	780	600	600	
iii. Duplex (two units, each on its own fee simple lot)		300	300	300	300	
b. Duplex special provisions						
i. Front face differential setbacks			The front faces of individual units shall be setback from each other by a minimum of 1.5 metres			
d. Triplex and quadplex			780 or corner lot	780 or corner lot		
e. Townhouse units with individual fee simple lots				200		
f. Maximum number of storeys	3	3	3	3	3	1 1/2
g. Maximum Height (metres)						

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
i. Principal building	11.0	11.0	11.0; For all building types except for townhouses the third storey shall have a minimum roof slope of 8 vertical run to 12 horizontal run			5.5; the ridge of pitched roofs with a minimum slope of six to 12 may extend up to 7.6 m; all parts of the roof above 5.5 m shall be pitched.
ii. Accessory building greater than 10 m ²	7.5	7.5	7.5	4.5 for pitched roof; 3.7 for flat roof	7.5	4.5 for pitched roof; 3.7 for flat roof
iii. Accessory structure less than 10 m ²	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
e. Maximum lot coverage (%)	30	40	50	50	50	60; 50 when a secondary suite is present for R-6 Small House Zone
f. Minimum setbacks for principal and accessory buildings or structures (metres)						

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
i Front lot line	7.5	7.5	a) For single detached, duplex, triplex, and quadplex dwellings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1 to garage face; • 4.5 to front face of dwelling; • the garage face shall in all cases be set back a minimum of 1.5 metres further than the dwelling front face. b) For townhouses: 4.5 to dwelling face and garage face; front porches may extend into the setback.			1.5
ii. Rear lot line	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.0	4.5	1.5
iii. Interior side lot line	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2
iv. Interior side lot line for duplexes and townhouses on fee simple lots	Use shall be separated only by a common party wall.					
v. Exterior side lot line	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.5	1.5
g. Minimum setbacks for accessory structures of less than 10m ² (metres)						
i. Front lot line	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	4.5	n/a
ii. Rear lot line	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	n/a
iii. Interior side lot line	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	n/a
iv. Exterior side lot line	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.5	n/a

b) Replacing it with Table B:

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
Standards						
a. Minimum Lot Size (square metres) or lot location						
i. Single dwelling	600	600	600	500	350	275
ii. Duplex (two units on a single lot strata)		780	780	600	600	
iii. Duplex (two units, each on its own fee simple lot)		300	300	300	300	
iv. Triplex and quadplex			780 or corner lot	780 or corner lot		
v. Townhouse units with individual fee simple lots				200		
b. Maximum number of storeys						
	3	3	3	3	3	1 1/2
c. Maximum Height (metres)						

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
i. Principal building	11.0	11.0	11.0; For all building types except for townhouses the third storey shall have a minimum roof slope of 8 vertical run to 12 horizontal run			5.5; the ridge of pitched roofs with a minimum slope of six to 12 may extend up to 7.6 m; all parts of the roof above 5.5 m shall be pitched.
ii. Accessory building greater than 10 m ²	7.5	7.5	7.5	4.5 for pitched roof; 3.7 for flat roof	7.5	4.5 for pitched roof; 3.7 for flat roof
iii. Accessory structure less than 10 m ²	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
d. Maximum lot coverage (%)						
	30	40	50	50	50	60; 50 when a secondary suite is present for R-6 Small House Zone
e. Minimum setbacks for principal and accessory buildings or structures (metres)						

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
i Front lot line	7.5	7.5	a) For single detached, duplex, triplex, and quadplex dwellings: i) 6.1 m ii) despite section i) above, the front face of the dwelling may extend into the front setback 1.5 m b) For townhomes: 4.5 m to dwelling front face and garage front face AND front porches may extend into the setback		For single detached and duplex dwellings: a) 6.0 m to garage face; b) 4.5 m to front face of dwelling; c) the garage face shall in all cases be setback a minimum of 1.5 m further than the dwelling front face	1.5
ii. Rear lot line	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.0	4.5	1.5
iii. Interior side lot line	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2
iv. Interior side lot line for duplexes and townhouses on fee simple lots		Use shall be separated only by a common party wall.				
v. Exterior side lot line	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.5	1.5
f. Duplex special provisions						
Front face differential setbacks		The front faces of individual units shall be setback from each other by a minimum of 1.5 metres				

Low and Medium Density Residential Zone Districts Standards						
District Name and Symbol	Suburban R-1	Urban R-2	Traditional Urban R-3	Medium Density R-4	Single Detached and Duplex R-5	Small House R-6
g. Minimum setbacks for accessory structures of less than 10m ² (metres)						
i. Front lot line	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	4.5	n/a
ii. Rear lot line	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	n/a
iii. Interior side lot line	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	n/a
iv. Exterior side lot line	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.5	n/a

3. FORCE AND EFFECT

That upon adoption of this bylaw, Bylaw No. 1124-2025, the Town of Lake Cowichan Zoning Bylaw No. 1055-2021 shall hereby be amended and take effect.

READ A FIRST TIME on the __ day of _____, 2025.

READ A SECOND TIME on the __ day of _____, 2025.

READ A THIRD TIME on the __ day of _____, 2025.

PUBLIC HEARING not required pursuant to sections 464(2) and 467 of the *Local Government Act*.

RECONSIDERED, FINALLY PASSED and ADOPTED by the Municipal Council of the Town of Lake Cowichan on the __ day of _____, 2025.

Tim McGonigle
Mayor

John Thomas
Corporate Officer