

I am Lynda ter Borg and I reside at 5860 Sandpiper Court in Richmond. From my perspective as a realtor, I see hundreds of homes each year, and I have extensively studied the issues before us. I am able to speak to your choice amongst the 3 amendment options, presented to you by staff today, to control massing and height issues of new house construction.

You will need to ask staff to provide a few more tools to be able to better control the massing and height issues. Maximum lot depth and envelope articulation are tools left in the backroom for future consideration. The Design Advisory Design Panel expressed support for a 50% maximum lot depth but we don't see that recommendation in any of the 3 proposals. The tools must be applied as a whole to houses being built in order for these controls to be successful. Houses that are too high, too wide, or too deep simply do not fit in a lot.

The processes used by staff were ones of expediency. Public consultation was token and superficial. We asked to meet to review these proposals to evaluate how the changes affect current building practices but were refused. The bundling of choices in the recommendations is not supportable without additions to these amendment proposals.

There is no choice in the three proposals to control the height issues. All three proposals separate 2 storey height and 2 and a half storey height to 29.5 feet and 34.5 feet respectively. No other municipality separates these two styles of houses. We need to remember these zoning bylaws will eventually have to fit the 4000 smaller and shorter to depth LUC properties. Staff suggested at the builder's forum, if a two and a half storey house on farm land, or a property with view, and has a specific need, they can best proceed by way of a variance request with neighbourhood consultation.

The following is an example from the MLS of a house built after the 2008 height change to 34.5 feet. The lot size has a maximum allowable FAR 3120 sq. ft. One year later it sold at 3950 sq. ft. with realtor comments "all available space is maximized into bonus living area." But that is not the end of the storey. That same house was back on the market at 4380 sq. ft. with now the realtor comments describing "3 expansive levels" and with a "registered plan showing 3116 sf., builder added 3<sup>rd</sup> level with no permits." 1264 sq. ft. or 40% added FAR!

Here is an example of a house being built at 8291 Fairfax Place (SHOW PICTURE). I call it the "attic with view windows." This house has huge windows into the attic space and you can see clearly from the street all the roof trusses. I was walking by yesterday and was invited inside to view. The gentlemen in the house told me the room and staircase to the attic would be added later. This is a zoning house, not LUC, and has a very tiny 2% pitch. Is this not a flat roof?

This last example on Bates shows a house built with the entire first floor at 16 ft (5m). (SHOW PICTURE)

We have a problem in Richmond applying the zoning bylaws as they are intended to be interpreted. In the public consultation "Attachment 3" page PLN-172 the record says I presented "legal" double height examples. How ridiculous, I would like the minutes corrected to read that all my examples showed illegal, unrestricted ceiling, double height in completed homes. These examples were not to some lowered ceiling trying to comply with the current 16ft ( 5 m )standard but were full one storey 20 feet

interior and exterior height and definitely, inspected and approved in breach of the City's zoning bylaws.

How can we have such a disjoint from intention and enforcement of our Bylaws? Freely gifting additional double height bonus space or what is now being called "exception space" is in direct opposition to our intention to control massing and building height. The staff recommended proposal is the only proposal that makes this gift to increase to interior massing. The issue is how the volume inside a house affects those who live next door. The rules should be simple and clear. Gifting an extra 160 ft<sup>2</sup> of floating double height space is working against the intention to control massing.

Our Bylaws already grant 10m<sup>2</sup> of double height space that is specifically attached to staircase and entrance foyer functions. This creates the grand entrance of a finely designed home. I can assure you the City is already being very liberal in this interpretation, as the majority of entrance foyer's are well in excess of a 10ft X 10 foot space. A new freely floating additional space, 150% more than currently allowed, is governed by additional setback requirements and will be a problem for staff to administer and enforce. Why create more problems? The staff proposal doesn't even have the additional setbacks properly and accurately written. For this reason alone this proposal cannot be accepted without corrections required.

Corrections for errors and omissions must also be made to setbacks for accessory buildings. The deletions in all three proposals have removed setback requirements for rear lot and interior side lot lines. Good fences make good neighbours but I don't think a 700 sq ft building measuring, 13 feet tall, and covering 40% of your backyard is a good neighbour substitute for a 6 foot backyard fence.

Speaking of setbacks and Vertical lot width envelope. My 1970's house has side yard setbacks of 2 meters or 6 feet. We are 12 feet from our neighbour, wall to wall. Today's current Zoning Bylaw 8.1.6.3 (a) says the minimum interior side yard is 2.0 m (6.5 feet) for lots greater than 65 feet wide. Sounds great however, this is now translated as 1.2meters minus 0.6m for projections for fireplaces we no longer build, for dining room buffets, bayed windows, inter alia. Resulting in 2 foot wide sideyards that are narrower than a door way. No space for a wheelbarrow or wheelchair to pass thru to the backyard.

**Please support the 3.7 meter ceiling/storey height option. Bylaw 9265, with no additional bonus to double height, and make the necessary corrections to bring all houses to a common building height of 29.5 ft. (9m) , add those set back corrections for accessory buildings... and please also correct the front page so you are recommending the correct amendment Bylaw (see front page for error).**

Earn back the credibility, the transparency and the accountability this municipality needs by introducing one year completion inspections, conducting random audit inspections during construction and after completion by different inspectors, and by instituting stringent design check lists for plan checkers and builders to follow.

I could go on but I won't. A Public Hearing should not be the place to have to hammer out these housekeeping issues. Enforce not only the Bylaws but also their intent.



