



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee Planning and Development Division


**To:** Planning Committee  
**From:** Wayne Craig  
Director of Development

**Date:** June 10, 2015  
**File:** 08-4430-01/2015-Vol 01

**Re:** **Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments to Regulate Building Massing and Accessory Structures in Single-Family Developments**




### Staff Recommendations

1. That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9249 to amend the zoning regulations for building massing and accessory structure locations within single-family, coach house and two-unit dwelling zones be introduced and given first reading;
2. That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9249 be forwarded to a Special Public Hearing to be held Monday, July 6, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at Council Chambers at Richmond City Hall; and
3. That staff report back to Planning Committee in one year on the implementation of the proposed zoning amendments to regulate building massing and accessory structures in single-family developments.

  
Wayne Craig  
Director of Development

GW/BK/JC:blg  
Att.

### REPORT CONCURRENCE

<b>REPORT CONCURRENCE</b>		
<b>ROUTED TO:</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE</b>	<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>
Law	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE</b>	<b>INITIALS:</b> 	<b>APPROVED BY CAO</b> 

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

At the Public Hearing held April 20, 2015, Council passed the following referral motion:

- (1) That staff investigate options to better control issues related to overall building massing and construction of high ceilings, including but not limited to:
  - a. what other municipalities are doing;
  - b. enforcement options; and report back through Planning Committee;*
- (2) That staff consult with stakeholders, residents, architects and home designers on the matter; and*
- (3) That staff refer the matter to the Richmond Advisory Design panel for analysis and comment.*

This report responds to this referral and brings forward a number of proposed amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 as follows:

- i. Amend the calculation of density in single-family zones and the exemption clause for over – height areas.
- ii. Revise the permitted vertical and horizontal single-family building envelope regulations.
- iii. Revise the calculation of maximum building height for single-family dwellings.
- iv. Revise setbacks and size limits for accessory buildings.
- v. Introduce new height and massing regulations for attached garages to single-family house construction.
- vi. Presents information related to non-compliant construction.

### **Background**

The referral motion was made in response to recent comments raised by members of the public during the April 20, 2015 Public Hearing regarding the style and massing of new single-family house construction in a number of neighbourhoods in the City. These comments echo similar concerns raised by residents through email submissions to Mayor and Councillors, and recent news stories published in the local media.

Issues regarding the compatibility of new single-family development (largely relating to house size, height and massing) raised by the public are not unique to Richmond, as municipalities throughout the region are facing similar challenges as redevelopment occurs within the context of established single-family neighbourhoods.

The proposed bylaw amendments outlined in this report would be only applicable to lots regulated under Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. Single-family and two-unit dwelling residential properties regulated by Land Use Contracts would not be subject to the proposed regulations. Should successful early discharge of Land Use Contracts be accomplished and those properties regulated under Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500, these regulations would then be applicable to all single-family and two-unit dwelling residential lots in the City.

## **Analysis**

### Existing Zoning Regulations

Current zoning bylaw provisions regulate building height and massing for single family and two-unit dwellings through a range of measures, including:

- Maximum building height is 9 m, measured to the mid-point of the roof, with an additional 1.5 roof height above the mid-point – to a maximum peak height of 10.5 m for a sloped roof meeting specified slopes of between 4:12 and 12:12 pitch.
- The residential vertical and horizontal building envelopes regulate how and where building massing can be constructed in relation of property lines.
- The calculation of floor area permits an exception for floor area over 5 m (16 ft.) high, up to a maximum 10 m<sup>2</sup> if that area is used for stairway and entry.
- Accessory buildings less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area have no minimum required setback from property lines.
- The height of an attached garage can be the same as the principal building.

On April 20, 2015 Council adopted Richmond Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 9223 which incorporated a number of amendments to regulate 2 ½ storey massing and roof designs. The new regulations are now in effect and regulate building form for single detached and two-unit dwellings.

When first crafted, the Zoning Bylaw regulations regarding building height and massing were generally adequate to address the construction practices and house style of the day. With the passage of time, the fundamental designs of single-family and two-unit dwellings have changed. Recent construction practices have seen an increase in floor to ceiling heights from the ‘standard’ 8 ft. ceiling height of the past, to a more common 11 ft. ceiling height for the ground floor and a 10 ft. height for second floor. The demand for taller interior spaces has raised the basic height and massing of a single-family dwelling.

In addition, there is demand for tall living room, dining room, and ‘great room’ spaces, many of which employ a higher interior space. Designers are also incorporating vaulted, cathedral or coffered ceilings, which may result in increased vertical massing of the building, often expressed as large wall faces and tall entry features.

### **Practices in Other Jurisdictions**

Staff have undertaken a review of zoning bylaws and massing regulations in a number of jurisdictions in the region, and a summary table is provided in Attachment 1. While the City of Richmond is among the cities with provisions to allow an interior ceiling height over 4 m, the 10 m<sup>2</sup> exemption for over-height ceiling areas for foyer and entry is also consistent with several other cities in the region.

### **Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments**

To address the Council referral from April 20, 2015, staff have reviewed our existing zoning regulations, and have drafted Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 9249 to better regulate the

height and massing of single-family and two-unit developments, and address concerns with accessory buildings. The proposed amendments are presented below.

Maximum Height for Single-Family Zones: Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 specifies that the maximum height for a building is measured from finished site grade to the mid-point of a pitched roof at 9.0 m (29.5 ft), with an allowance for an additional 1.5 m (5 ft.) above that point to the roof ridge, so long as specified roof pitch is met. The maximum height is therefore 10.5 m (34.5 ft).

Staff propose that the measurement of maximum height be amended to lower the height for two-storey house to 9 m (29.5 ft.) to the roof peak, eliminating the use of the mid-point of the roof, and the allowed additional 1.5 m (5 ft.).

Staff propose to retain the provision to measure the maximum height for 2 ½ storey single-family dwellings to the mid-point of roof, to preserve the ability to achieve a functional half-storey concealed within a pitched roof. By allowing the additional 1.5 m (ft) above the mid-point of a sloping roof, the half-storey floor area can be more effectively designed to be within the roof line and provide adequate light, air and functional habitable space. The amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 8500 approved on April 20, 2015 through Bylaw 9223 would be applicable to any proposed 2 ½ storey house.

Residential Vertical Lot Width Envelope: Section 3.4 of the Zoning Bylaw provides descriptions and graphic representation of how horizontal and vertical building envelopes are to be determined. Revisions are proposed to increase the spatial separation between houses, reducing the impact of upper storey massing, and allow more light into required yards. Staff propose amendments to better reflect the range of lot widths currently possible under the Zoning Bylaw. The major changes are to change the angle at which the envelope is calculated for wider lots from 45° to 30°, and to clarify the articulation of the building envelope.

In order to accommodate the substantive regulations proposed, it is necessary to remove the definition and graphic from Section 3.4 Use and Term Definitions, and create a new section 4.18 in Part 4 – General Development Regulations. These amendments will re-define the envelope for lots less than 10 m in width, between 10 and 18 m in width, and greater than 18 m in width.

Staff propose to insert the amendments as a new Section 4.18 - Residential Vertical Lot Width Envelope, and these are shown in proposed Bylaw 9249.

Interior Ceiling Height: In response to the referral from Council, staff propose that the Zoning Bylaw be amended as presented in Bylaw 9249 to:


- Create a new definition of ceiling height which specifically ties the maximum ceiling height to a structural component such as roof truss or floor joist above, eliminating the use of dropped ceilings to achieve the height requirement.
- Reduce the maximum ceiling height before the area is double counted for the purpose of determining the maximum Floor Area ration (FAR) from 5 m (16 ft.) to 3.7 m (12 ft.).

In recognition of the importance the building community has placed on tall interior ceiling spaces, the proposed bylaw amendment would allow additional 15 m<sup>2</sup> of higher ceiling area – up to a maximum height of 5 m (16 ft.) located internally to the building to be counted once (rather than double) towards the maximum floor area. This 15 m<sup>2</sup> space must be set back an additional 2.0 m (6 ft.) from any required interior side yard or rear yard setback. This 15 m<sup>2</sup> exception is in addition to the 10 m<sup>2</sup> exception for exclusively entry and stair purposes.

Exterior Wall Ceiling Expression: Recent house trends, including the general increase of the height of the top ceiling plate which has resulted in tall building facades. Proposed Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9249 would address this issue by requiring that no exterior wall that fronts onto the required rear or interior side yard setback can have an eave line or other exterior expression taller than 3.7 m above the finished floor, if the construction takes advantage of the exceptions for interior ceiling height (i.e. 10 m<sup>2</sup> exception for entry and stair purposes and the 15m<sup>2</sup> general exception for ceiling height between 3.7 m and 5 m). This proposed amendment would not preclude a ‘traditional’ two-storey house design with two (2) stacked floors.

A simplified cross-section of how this revised provision would be implemented is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 –Interior Ceiling Height Regulation (Recommended)



Staff are of the opinion that the combination of the reduced interior ceiling height of 3.7 m (12 ft.) from 5.0 m (16 ft) before the floor area is counted twice for density purposes, in combination with the proposed additional setbacks for the additional 15 m<sup>2</sup> (215 ft<sup>2</sup>) permitted exception will result in reduced massing on the exterior of the house and should address a number of the concerns raised by Council and members of the public.

We note for Council that these proposed amendments do not prohibit the construction of a ceiling higher than 3.7 m (12 ft.), but rather, establish the limit in terms of internal ceiling height and clarification of the potential area for exceptions for calculation of floor area of the house.

Any homeowner or builder can submit a Building Permit showing a ceiling height greater than the proposed 3.7 m limit, but the overall floor area of the house must be reduced accordingly.

Accessory Buildings: Staff have recently encountered a number of issues arising from the current zoning regulations of accessory buildings on single-family lots. Specific areas of concern are:

- The permitted size of a detached accessory building in rear yards.
- The maximum 5 m (16 ft.) permitted height for an accessory building.
- Existing required setbacks for accessory buildings.

*Size of Detached Accessory Building in Rear Yard:* We note for Council that the BC Building Code does not require a Building Permit to be issued for small accessory buildings of 10 m<sup>2</sup> or less in area. Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 allows an accessory building to be constructed in a rear yard, so long as any portion of the portion of the accessory building which exceeds 10 m<sup>2</sup> is counted towards the overall floor area of the house. If the detached building is used for on-site parking, the building can be 50 m<sup>2</sup> in area before the building is counted towards floor area of the principal building. There have been recent Building Permits submitted which have resulted in an accessory building used for parking to be only marginally smaller than the single-family dwelling on the property.

*Setbacks for Detached Accessory Buildings:* Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 currently allows an accessory building of less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area to be constructed with no setback to any property line. An accessory building greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> must be constructed at a minimum of 3.0 m (10 ft.) from a constructed road, and 1.2 m (4 ft.) from any other property line. Recently, construction of accessory buildings less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area have been sited according to the bylaw, but have resulted in poor interface to adjacent roads and surrounding properties.

To better regulate the size and setbacks for detached accessory buildings, staff propose amendments to General Development Regulations in Part 4 of Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 as follows:

- Detached accessory buildings up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the rear yard.
- The area of all detached accessory buildings located entirely or partially in the rear yard cover no more than 40% of the rear yard.
- The setback from the front lot line must be at least 20.0 m.
- The setback from the exterior side lot line must be at least 7.5 m.

*Height of Detached Accessory Buildings:* Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 currently allows an accessory building to be constructed with a maximum height of 5 m (16.2 ft.). Recent construction of detached accessory buildings has resulted in unacceptable impacts on neighbourhood character. To better control the height of accessory buildings in residential zones staff propose amendments to General Development Regulations in Part 4 of the Zoning Bylaw as follows:

- The maximum height for detached accessory buildings less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 3.0 m for a detached accessory building with a pitched roof, and 2.5 m for a detached accessory building with a flat roof.
- The maximum height for detached accessory buildings greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 4.0 m to the roof ridge for an accessory building with a pitched roof, and 3.0 m for an accessory building with a flat roof.

Staff are of the opinion that this amendment in tandem with the revised setbacks for detached accessory structures will mitigate the recent issues associated with these buildings.

*Height of Projecting Attached Garage:* Recent construction trends for single-family and two-unit dwellings have seen increasingly tall garage roofs for forward projecting attached garages. These projecting garages are a dominant architectural feature, and have the potential for subsequent illegal conversion to habitable space. This is one of the most common forms of illegal conversion, which results in the overall house size exceeding that permitted by the Zoning Bylaw. Staff propose an amendment to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to limit the height of an attached garage:

- The maximum height for an attached garage constructed as part of a principal building is 6.0 m to the roof ridge for a garage with a pitched roof, and 4.5 m for a garage with a flat roof.

We note that the proposed bylaw amendment to limit the height of attached garages is beyond the scope of the April 20, 2015 referral, but staff are of the opinion that tall garage roofs are a contributing factor to the overall massing of a single-family dwelling. Should Council choose to not support the inclusion of this amendment, the bylaw could be amended at the Planning Committee meeting to delete proposed Section 4.14.4 (c) from Bylaw 9249, and the revised bylaw forwarded to Council for consideration of first reading.

### **Richmond Advisory Design Panel Commentary**

These proposed amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 were presented to Richmond's Advisory Design Panel at their May 21, 2015 meeting. Panel members posed a number of questions, and made a comment that the Richmond Zoning Bylaw interior ceiling height allowance of up to 5 m (16 ft.) was very generous compared to other jurisdictions and suggested that it be reduced. Panel members cited their experience with similar massing regulations and cautioned staff that there can be unintended consequences of massing regulations; such as increased homogeneity of house design or somewhat odd upper storey configurations based on building envelope regulations.

Design Panel comments were generally supportive of the direction proposed. Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Meeting are provided in Attachment 2.

### **Bylaw Enforcement**

There is a perception that many new homes are being altered after building permit inspections through post-approval changes and/or illegal construction. Staff in the Building Approvals Department has inspection and enforcement powers to address any illegal construction, which is

adequate to address these issues. The Building Approvals Department investigates all claims related to construction that may be occurring without a City issued Building Permit and appropriate action is taken to rectify these situations.

To improve the existing inspection and enforcement aspects of their work, Senior Management in the Building Approvals Department will be implementing new processes to ensure that Senior Management is immediately notified of any field alterations to approved Building Permit documents that result in changes to the calculation of density. Work to those portions of the construction shall stop, and may not resume until revised drawings demonstrating compliance to all zoning and building regulations are submitted and approved. If compliance cannot be demonstrated, the non-approved work will be removed or remediated to achieve compliance.

To further improve compliance at Plan Review stage, staff will request additional drawings and specifications; such as multiple cross-sections and large scale plans of over height floor areas to show accurately their extent and contribution to density. Ambiguous or unclear plans will require revision or supplemental information.

### **Additional Consultation**

Staff presented the suite of proposed amendments to the Richmond Small Builders Group, a representative of the Greater Vancouver Home Builder's Association, the Urban Development Institute, and members of the public.

The Urban Development Institute and the Greater Vancouver Home Builder's Association raised concerns regarding the imposition of additional regulations stifling the creativity of house designers, and commented on the underlying market trends which have led to the current style of house design and massing throughout the City.

A meeting was held with the Richmond Small Builders Group, and with interested members of the public on May 26, 2015. There was general commentary that the visual impact of the over-height ceiling areas was a major concern, along with the general height of new house construction. Members of the public raised questions regarding the use of other planning tools; such as single-family design guidelines in the Official Community Plan (OCP) or various area plans.

Staff note for Council that guidelines for single family development cannot be implemented without designation of single family areas as Development Permit areas, which would result in a Council issued Development Permit being required before a Building Permit could be considered. Pursuing the Development Permit designation would require a comprehensive legal review, considerable community consultation, amendments to the OCP and all areas plan. It is further noted that implementing such an approach would result in significant additional process requirements for single family development and require considerable new staff resources to administer. Staff are of the opinion that the amendments proposed in Bylaw 9249 will address many of the concerns raised by residents. Minutes of the May 26, 2015 meeting are provided in Attachment 3.



The Richmond Small Builders Group expressed concerns with a number of the proposed amendments, including a desire to maintain higher ceilings, and to not make the single-family design process overly complicated. The Small Builders Group have suggested that reducing the height of two-storey houses to 9.0 m, and maintaining the 5 m ceiling height, but requiring measurement from the top of floor to the underside of the floor structure above, would be sufficient changes to address the complaints recently heard by Council.

Some builders in attendance and the public mentioned that a single-family 'Design Panel' could be considered as a mechanism to review house design. Staff do not recommend that a single-family Design Review Panel be pursued, as such a review panel would have no impact unless the Development Permit Area designation described above is implemented. Other correspondence received by staff is provided in Attachment 4.

### **Implementation**

Upon adoption of the bylaw, staff will immediately implement the changes, and all Building Permit applications submitted after the adoption date will be required to meet the amended requirements.

Staff will also assess the changes to building design and massing over a period of one year and will report back to the Planning Committee on the impact of the proposed changes.

### **Alternate Bylaw Options for Interior Ceiling Height and Density Calculation**

Staff have attached two (2) additional bylaws: Bylaw 9265 and Bylaw 9266 to this report, should Council wish to consider other options. Staff are of the opinion that recommended Bylaw 9249 successfully addresses Council's April 20, 2015 referral, and provides a framework for improved single-family and two-unit dwelling massing.

These two (2) bylaws are identical to Bylaw 9249; which staff recommend, save for the clauses related to Interior Ceiling Height. These options are discussed below.

**Bylaw 9265 – 3.7 m internal ceiling height:** Bylaw 9265 (Attachment 5) would reduce the maximum permitted ceiling height to 3.7 m (12 ft.) and would maintain the area exempt from floor area calculation at 10 m<sup>2</sup>. This bylaw also includes the provisions to clarify how ceiling height is measured, and contains the provision limiting the exterior wall expression of top plate of the first storey to 3.7 m above finished floor.

**Bylaw 9266 - 5.0 m internal ceiling height:** Bylaw 9266 (Attachment 6) would permit a maximum ceiling height of 5.0 m (16 ft.) limit before the over-height area is counted for floor area, and would leave the exemption area at 10 m<sup>2</sup>. This bylaw includes the same provisions to clarify how ceiling height is measured, requiring the measurement of ceiling height to a structural element and , and the provision limiting the exterior wall expression of top plate of the first storey to 3.7 m above finished floor.

### **Financial Impact or Economic Impact**

None.

## Conclusion

City Council passed a referral motion that staff examine measures and options to better regulate the massing of new single-family houses. Staff have reviewed current bylaw standards and practices from adjacent municipalities regarding these issues. Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 9249 is attached for Council's consideration, and presents a range of amendments to better regulate massing of single detached and two-unit dwellings.

The proposed amendments amend and clarify the building massing regulations in the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to make it easier for Building Division staff to review plans, and ensure that submitted Building Permits conform to the Zoning regulations. The proposed bylaw also provides a number of changes to address the range and scope of issues raised by residents in the recent past.


It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw No. 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9249 be introduced and given first reading.



Gavin Woo  
Senior Manager, Building Approvals  
(604-276-4113)



Barry Konkin  
Program Coordinator, Development  
(604-276-4138)



James Cooper  
Manager, Plan Review  
(604-247-4606)

GW/BK:blg

- Attachment 1: Practices in Other Jurisdictions
- Attachment 2: Minutes of the May 21, 2015 Advisory Design Panel Meeting
- Attachment 3: Meeting Notes from Public Consultation Meeting of May 26, 2015
- Attachment 4: Other Correspondence Received
- Attachment 5: Bylaw 9265 (Not recommended)
- Attachment 6: Bylaw 9266 (Not recommended)

District	Maximum Height (Pitch Roof)	Maximum Height (Flat Roof)	Maximum Accessory Structure Height	Ceiling Height	Exempted Area for Foyer/ Staircase
City of Surrey	9.0 m	9.0 m	4.0 m	> 3.7 m (12ft)	19 m <sup>2</sup>
City of North Vancouver	9.14 m	N/A	3.6 m (12ft)	> 4.57 m (15ft)	Staircase and landings are visible from the street.
District of North Vancouver	7.3 - 8.53 m	6.71 m	3.66 m (for a flat roof) / 4.67 - 5.64 m (to peak)	> 3.66 m	No exemptions.
City of Burnaby	9.0 m	7.4 m	4.6 m	3.7 m (12ft) measured to exterior top plate with an additional 4ft interior allowance (16ft)	9.3 m <sup>2</sup>
City of White Rock	8.5 m	7.7 m	3.0 m	N/A	N/A
City of New Westminster	9.0 m (to midpoint) / 10.67 m (to peak)	6.1 m	4.57 m	N/A	N/A
City of Vancouver	9.5 m (10.7 m at discretion)	N/A	3.7 m (for a flat roof) / 4.6 m (to peak)	> 3.7 m (12ft)	Up to 1% of maximum FAR to improve light and ventilation.
Corporation of Delta	9.5 m	8.0 m	3.75 m (for a flat roof) / 4.6 m (to peak)	> 4.3 m (14ft)	10 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>City of Richmond<sup>1</sup></b>	9.0 m (to midpoint) / 10.5 m (to peak)	7.5 m	5.0 m	> 5 m (16ft)	10 m <sup>2</sup> for entry and stairs.

## **Advisory Design Panel**

**Thursday, May 21, 2015**

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Place: Rm. M.1.003  
City of Richmond

Present: Grant Brumpton, Chair  
Tom Parker  
Xuedong Zhao  
Michael Mammone  
Jane Vorbrodt  
Jubin Jalili

Also Present: Diana Nikolic, Planner 2  
David Brownlee, Planner 2  
Suzanne Carter-Huffman, Senior Planner/Urban Design  
Barry Konkin, Program Coordinator-Development  
James Cooper, Manager, Plan Review  
Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals  
Rustico Agawin, Auxiliary Committee Clerk  
Lisa Jones – Auxilliary Architect, Building Approvals Division

Absent: Matthew Thomson  
Paul Goodwin  
Steve Jedreicich  
Cst. Barry Edwards

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

### **1. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**

It was moved and seconded

*That the minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel held on Thursday, April 16, 2015, be adopted.*

**CARRIED**

## Advisory Design Panel

Thursday, May 21, 2015

---

- like the variety of different architectural styles; appreciate the idea of extended planes; however, it could be further extended throughout the proposed development to tie together the different architectural styles; consider extended planes of materials other than glass, e.g. concrete, brick, etc.; proposed pillar does not appear to work with the idea of extended planes; consider design development;
- the west tower's curved wall does not appear dynamic in the model; consider applying the idea of extended plane to the curved wall or other measures to make it more exciting;
- Pearson Way (south) elevation/frontage needs more attention; streetscape character with street trees in metal grates is not successful; enhanced landscaping may be an effective way to tie together the different architectural elements and make the street more pedestrian friendly; consider further landscaping treatment, e.g. introducing pockets of greens and shrubs to add layering;
- 
- appreciate the well-resolved programming at the podium level; appreciate the green roofs in the upper levels; however, look at access to the green roofs for maintenance work; and
- review the proposed colour (white) and cladding for the affordable housing units and consider long-term maintenance issues.

### Panel Decision

It was moved and seconded

***That DP 14-662341 be supported to move forward to the Development Permit Panel subject to the applicant giving consideration to the comments of the Panel.***

**CARRIED**

*(At this point, Jubin Jalili rejoined the Panel and participated in the Panel's consideration of Item No. 4)*

#### **4. PANEL REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SINGLE FAMILY ZONES/ ZONING BYLAW TO ADDRESS HEIGHT AND MASSING CONCERNS**

PROPOSER: City of Richmond (Planning and Building)

# Advisory Design Panel

Thursday, May 21, 2015

---

## Staff's Presentation

Barry Konkin, Program Coordinator-Development, advised that as per Council's referral to staff in the April 20<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing, staff is seeking the Panel's analysis and comments on the proposed package of measures to control the overall building height, massing and interior ceiling height of single-family homes. Mr. Konkin clarified that staff proposals labelled as Future Considerations regarding revisions to existing building envelope regulations included in the package circulated to Panel members will still need further study and analysis and will not form part of proposed Zoning Bylaw 8500 amendments to be recommended by staff to Council.

James Cooper, Manager, Plan Review, provided background information regarding the trend in construction of large infill single-family homes and noted the concerns raised by existing single-family. Mr. Cooper mentioned that the goal of the proposed revisions to the existing zoning bylaw is to provide the appropriate controls in overall building height and vertical building envelope to ensure compatibility of new single-family developments within existing single-family neighbourhoods.

Mr. Cooper highlighted the following proposed modifications to the single-family zoning bylaw that would significantly impact on the height and massing of single-family homes:

- for 2-storey construction on lot widths less than 18 metres, reduction of (i) maximum overall building height from 10.5 metres to 9 metres, (ii) vertical perimeter wall height from 6 to 5 metres,;
- for 2 ½ -storey construction on lot widths less than 18 metres, (i) maximum building height is 9.0 metres measured to the midpoint between the highest ridge and eave line and 10.5 m to the peak of the roof, (ii) reduction of angle of vertical plane from 45 degrees from horizontal to 30 degrees;
- for 2-storey construction on lot widths more than 18 metres, reduction of (i) maximum building height from 10.5 metres to 9 metres to roof peak, (ii) vertical perimeter wall height from 6 metres to 5 metres, (iii) angle of vertical plane from 45 degrees horizontal to 30 degrees, and introduction of second-storey setback; and
- for 2.5-storey construction on lot widths more than 18 metres, (i) maximum building height is 9.0 metres measured to the midpoint between the highest ridge and eave line and 10.5 metres to the roof peak, (ii) reduction of angle of vertical plane from 45 degrees from horizontal to 30 degrees, and (iii) introduction of second-storey setback.

## Advisory Design Panel

Thursday, May 21, 2015

---

Mr. Cooper added that the above proposals are intended to lower the height of single-family building and transfer the mass away from the neighbours to the middle of the buildable volume.

Also, Mr. Cooper presented (i) three options on maximum height definition of a storey to address concerns on building bulk due to high floor to floor heights, (ii) proposed changes to attached garage construction to control height and massing, (iii) proposed changes to limit the massing and required setbacks of detached accessory buildings with an area of 10 square metres or less, and (iv) massing and setback requirements for detached accessory building greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area, limited to a maximum of 40% of the rear yard, and a maximum size limit of 70 square metres. .

*(Jubin Jalili left the meeting at 6:15 p.m. and did not return)*

### **Panel Discussion**

*Comments from the Panel were as follows:*

With regard to the three options presented by staff regarding proposed changes to the current Zoning Bylaw 8500 height definition of a storey, a Panel member commented that (i) Option 1, which allows the maximum height definition of a storey to remain at 5 metres with the height defined to top plate of wall supporting the roof structure but not allowing drop ceiling, is susceptible to manipulations by the builder, (ii) the proposed maximum ceiling height of 5 metres is too generous even for big houses, and (iii) the proposed 3.7 metre maximum ceiling height is more appropriate.

With regard to the proposed amendments to the current Zoning Bylaw 8500 to control the massing of single-family homes, a Panel member noted that the goal can be achieved through a simpler formula which provides flexibility, not stifle creativity, and not cause uniformity of design of single-family homes.

A Panel member noted that staff is going in the right direction and expressed appreciation for their efforts to investigate the design implications of proposed amendments to current Zoning Bylaw 8500. Also, support was expressed for the staff proposal for a maximum building depth of 50 percent of the lot depth. In addition, it was noted that the staff proposals for the secondary vertical building envelope and wall plane articulation to control massing may result in homogeneity of house design.

Panel commented that more time is needed to study and provide their comments regarding the proposed amendments to Zoning Bylaw 8500. In response to the comment of Panel, Mr. Konkin advised that Panel members are welcome to submit their written comments to staff.

# Advisory Design Panel

Thursday, May 21, 2015

---

## 5. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded

*That the meeting be adjourned at 6:50 p.m.*

### **CARRIED**

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the Advisory Design Panel of the Council of the City of Richmond held on May 21, 2015.

---

Grant Brumpton  
Chair

---

Rustico Agawin  
Auxiliary Committee Clerk





**City of  
Richmond**

**Public Consultation**  
Planning and Development Department

## **Summary**

### **Study on Massing for Single Family Neighbourhoods**

**Location:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Galleria – Meeting Room 2.004

**Time/Date:** 17:00-19:00, May 26<sup>th</sup> 2015

**Staff Members Involved:**

*Barry Konkin (B)* – Program Coordinator (Development)  
*Gavin Woo (G)* – Senior Manager (Building Approvals)  
*James Cooper (J)* – Manager (Plan Review)

**Attendees:**

Aaron Meier	Kathryn McCreary	John ter Borg
Lyn ter Borg	Martin Woolford	Rod Lynde
Asit Thaliwal	Navtej Dhot	Barry Konkin
Raman Kooner	Khalid Hasan	Parm Dhinjal
Russ Barstow	Gursher Randhawa	Marty Gaetz
Rav Bains	Sam Sandhu	Brad Doré
Rafiq Sahikh	Anne Piché	Mike Mcfarland
Marco Ciciello	Lee Bennett	Timothy Tse
Graham Taylor	Graham Johnsen	Bob Hardacre
Liz Hardacre	Kim Kemp	

**Goals:**

1. To receive input on findings and proposed measures included in the Study on Massing for Single Family Neighbourhoods
2. To share viewpoints related to recent infill development in single-family residential neighbourhoods
3. To present consultation and discussion results to Mayor and Council.

**17:00**—Introductions by City of Richmond staff members. Presentation booklets were previously distributed to individuals present in the meeting.

---

**Presentation by James Cooper**

---

---

**17:03 – 17:20**—James Cooper presents “*Study on Massing for Single Family Neighbourhoods*”. Topics related to existing RS1 bylaws include:

- ‘Maximum Overall Building Height’
- ‘Vertical Building Envelope’
- ‘Maximum Storey Height Definition’,
- ‘Height of Attached Garages’
- ‘Maximum Floor Area
- ‘Height of Detached Accessory Buildings Requiring Building Permit’
- ‘Height and Location of Accessory Buildings Not Requiring a Building Permit’.

The proposed measures for bylaw amendment serve to reduce the maximum height of single-family dwellings by:

1. Reducing the maximum height
2. Refining the Vertical Building Envelope to produce better spatial separation and allow more light between adjacent houses
3. Define a maximum height for a single storey before the area is counted twice toward the maximum floor area density

---

#### **17:20—Floor Opened to Comments from the Audience**

---

**Question( John Terborg):** Why are ‘Future Considerations’ being presented in the PDF package?

**Answer (J):** There was a time constraint for the Study and proposed Bylaw Amendments. The additional provisions require more study in order to refine and vet for all lot dimensions.

**Comment(Rod Lynde):** The existing bylaw regulations do not define building aesthetic, and good taste cannot be legislated. Some do look ‘silly as designs are permitted within the regulations. The critical issue is one of appropriate design within the rules.

---

**Question (Ann Piche):** How will 12m and 10m wide lots be addressed? Current building envelope proposals may be too restrictive.

**Answer (J):** Lots less than twelve-metres wide will be addressed as additional refinement to the measures proposed in response to the comment.

---

**Question:** What is the easement to a wall?

**Answer (J):** Sideyard setbacks vary depending on the size of a lot. (Proceeded to explain existing sideyard setback requirements as per existing RS1 zoning bylaws).

---

---

**Question:** Why is the first floor constructed at eleven feet and the second floor constructed at nine feet?

**Answer (J):** This is a market trend we're seeing in new home construction for increasingly high ceilings.

---

**Comment (Gursher Randhawa):** There should be a collective look at the basic requirements a house needs for it to be considered "marketable". In this way, there is an economic value associated with the changes the City is proposing. At this time, homebuilders need to fit four bedrooms upstairs with three or four bathrooms.

---

**Question:** Why is garage height limited to eight feet or two and a half metres?

**Answer (J):** That is a dimension on the diagram that is not a limiting one. It is not meant that the maximum ceiling height in a garage is 8 feet or 2.5m.

---

**Question (Bob Hardacre):** For the City, the Official Community Plan (OCP) provides goals to maintain vibrant, sustainable residential neighbourhoods. Zoning has to support this OCP initiative and must be changed to be in line with preserving residential neighbourhoods. Current construction does not follow the framework provided by the OCP. Can the OCP be changed/amended to better dictate the residential neighbourhood goals?

**Answer (B):** The proposed measures address the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw as they relate to Single and 2 family home construction. The scope does not extend to alterations to the OCP.

---

**Question:** What makes a neighbourhood viable? What makes it liveable?

**Answer (J and audience):** Shadowing caused by excessively large houses has a negative impact on neighbourhoods—views and privacy are affected and massing is too large—which leads to further consequences.

**Answer (B):** The OCP cannot legislate design.

---

**Comment:** People are moving away because of these negative impacts\*.

*\*Anecdotal evidence that will require verification*

**Comment:** In the City, new house construction does not take existing housing stock into consideration when first designed.

**Comment:** Audience member would like to present case study houses, however, was told to wait until other audience members had a chance to speak

---

**Question (Marty Gaetz):** One or two "bad apples"—relative to the quality of design today—have created a backlash against new development. Homebuilders, general contractors, and other people who live in the City have a vested interest in the quality of these homes. As such, these groups do not intend to create a negative impact within their neighbourhoods. Perhaps the City should look into neighbourhood specific zoning.

---

**Answer (J):** The proposed changes are a “one size fits all” approach. It is difficult to amend general provisions that pertain to a variety of properties. The goal is to provide a set of regulations that define a buildable envelope that will be viable to both current market trends and the existing urban fabric of single family neighbourhoods.

---

**Comment (Lynda Terborg):** Current construction of massive houses does not respect the existing urban fabric of the City. Although the interior spaces of these homes may function for the owner’s/developer’s needs, the exterior expression of these spaces do not respect the needs of neighbouring homes and the rest of the community. An inquiry was made about providing site plan information.

**Comment (Lynda Terborg):** *(Resident presented case studies on massive homes in various neighbourhoods around the city).* Double height spaces were constructed legally, but floors were added after the fact that increased the square footage of the property. Slight confusion with regard to how setbacks are measured on properties. Resident was frustrated that an approximately 3500 square foot house was constructed on a 6000 square foot lot. It would have been allowed on a 9000 square foot lot, not a 6000 square foot one. Resident expressed a desire to change double height spaces and have the City prevent infilling of double height spaces.

---

**Question:** How does the City prevent homeowners from infilling double height spaces after construction and final inspection?

**Answer (G):** The City performs over 300 “building check” inspections a year responding to neighbour complaints, amongst them illegal construction. Only 2 have been detected by inspections in the last 20 years.

**Question:** How will the City control abuses to the 5.0m ceiling height in future?

**Answer (G):** The current bylaw does not prevent drop ceilings being used to define the maximum height of a space. As such, the 5.0m maximum height regulation for a floor area before it is counted twice toward maximum density has been abused resulting in unnecessarily high perimeter walls and unwanted upper level massing. An example of how the City currently interprets drop ceiling designs was illustrated and background information on drop ceilings was provided. The new regulations as proposed by the study will tie the ceiling height to the roof or floor structure prohibiting drop ceilings. This will eliminate the bulk contributed by the high walls that are currently much higher than the maximum allowed ceiling height.

---

**Comment:** It is easier to build houses with a consistent roof height due to issues related to truss layout and framing. The efficiency of tying together all the wall top plates at a single height to and the use of drop ceilings have contributed to some of the unnecessary bulk surrounding high ceiling spaces.

---

**Question:** In the 1990’s the Zoning bylaw was changed, providing a guide for what is now considered—from an aesthetic perspective—a poorly designed house. Why is this being allowed?

**Answer (G):** The wording in the bylaw is vague on the application of the 5.0m single story height and the City’s hands are tied on the matter.

---

**Comment:** Project specific details should be provided to show: any proposed drop ceilings, roof heights, and other miscellaneous spaces. One builder expressed his desire to have a one-room exemption allowance from the proposed maximum height definition of a storey. It was expressed that the proposed bylaw changes would restrict design and make plan layouts for the family, living, and dining rooms difficult. As a compromise, one of those three rooms should be exempt from the proposed height restrictions to free-up design opportunity.

**Comment:** No pony wall should be permitted above the five-metre height restriction so people cannot abuse the proposed amendments.

**Comment:** New house construction does not respect the existing built fabric. In 2008, Council made a serious error in allowing building heights to reach 10.5 m versus 9.0 m. The 16' double height space allowance should be eliminated since other municipalities enforce a lower maximum height.

---

**Question:** The audience was confused about the processes behind changing the bylaws.

**Answer (B):** As such, the administrative processes behind changing the bylaws were explained, including how the public would be involved. Steps include: this meeting and its minutes as discussed in this document will be reported on to a committee who will send its ideas/results to council. From there, Council will vote and a public forum will be held where residents may provide feedback.

---

**Question:** Does a house have valid insurance if the house is in-filled post-inspection? Is the 'Declaration of Information' rendered incorrect if a home-owner wants to sell their property at a later date? How does in-fill practice affect fire protection, etc.?

**Answer (J):** If the construction is manifested after final inspection, the home-owner's house insurance is rendered void.

---

**Comment:** The disallowance of 3<sup>rd</sup> floor decks from the zoning bylaw has an undesired impact on the development on Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) land. These properties should be allowed to have 3<sup>rd</sup> floor decks. In an example, if a deck faces ALR property it does not affect the neighbours—in terms of privacy. At this time, a guest expressed that the proposed bylaw changes scope is too broad in a similar way.

---

**Answer (J):** In the case of decks off the uppermost ½ storey in AGR land, an applicant may apply for a development variance to consider the minimal impacts.

---

**Question:** The City cannot compare bylaws between other municipalities, since comparing bylaws does not equate to an "apples-to-apples" comparison. Why is Richmond comparing the City's bylaws to bylaws made by other municipalities, when it is clearly not equal?

**Answer (J):** It is true that each municipality's zoning bylaw should be taken as a complete document and not cherry picked. In our approach we did a rigorous analysis of our current bylaw regulations to identify the regulations that may be refined in order to improve control of massing and bulk. The comparative study we used to guide our findings is much more extensive

in scope than the items presented in the table. Our proposed measures result from both a holistic look at our scope of regulations as well as those of other municipalities taken as a whole.

---

**Comment:** ‘Average grade calculation’ affects the maximum height of houses constructed in the City of Richmond. ‘Average grade calculation’ effectively reduces the volume of space that must fit within the existing zoning envelope (this is not to be construed as the height is lowered). Can you explain?

---

**Answer (J):** This is a “valid technical point,” since the ‘average site grade calculation’ tends to set the base plane for measurement of maximum height at a level that is lower than the finish grade around the house, acting to slightly lower the maximum height while the flood plain bylaw acts as a plunger pushing up the first floor elevation against the buildable envelope set by the average site grade.

---

**Answer (J):** Explained how average grade is calculated, since the process confused audience members. James explained that the floodplain elevation requirements in the City are a maximum of 0.6 m above the highest crown of road and not less than 0.3 m above it.

---

**Comment:** It was expressed that there are great designs in the City, as well as some really bad ones.

**Comment:** Decreasing the maximum building height would further “cram” designs. To build what the owner and/or developer desires—within the existing zoning envelope—is what leads to the problem of poorly designed houses. As such, we cannot “have our cake and eat it too.” Residents—as well as developers—must make compromises.

**Comment:** Everyone collectively agreed that the object of the meeting and proposal was to create positive change within the City, however, a misunderstanding by the general public—regarding the intent of the current bylaws and OCP—was raised, voicing general opposition to recent house design.

**Comment:** How can the public provide feedback on design proposals? A homebuilder expressed his desire to work with the City to make his design more responsive to the site. For example, the homebuilder prefers to have James’ input on the design before the construction permit is issued.

**Comment (Sam Sandhu):** The City of Vancouver preforms an inspection one year after construction; however, the City of Richmond does not. Additionally, house design requires attention to detail and a design panel for ‘single family dwellings’ is necessary to eradicate undesirable house design and construction.

**Comment:** The proposed zoning amendments must be “airtight” against possible manipulation primarily because Land Use Contracts (LUC) will expire and are required to be zoned as RS1, which is fast-approaching date. Over one year, 5,000 demolitions have taken place in the City.\*  
*\*Anecdotal evidence that will require verification*

**Comment:** The proposed changes do not represent all of the properties in the City of Richmond and only seem to apply to RS1/ E properties (RS1/ E properties are rapidly redeveloped).

**Comment:** A resident suggested that designers do not visualize their work before it is built. He argued that designers—of recent developments—do not understand the scale of their drawings on paper as they would be in the real-world. The resident expressed that the City needs architectural guidelines.

---

**Question:** ‘Infill housing’—when a house is replaced by a new house—does not respect the intention of the neighbourhood’s fabric. In example, the Westwind neighbourhood was initially designed using a set of required materials and typologies, however, new development does not consider the original criteria for new construction, which negatively impacts the neighbourhood visually. What are the criteria?

**Answer:** The City is not aware of a ‘design criteria’ that applies to the Westwind neighbourhood; however, a single developer may have had a specific vision for the neighbourhood, which is what the community sees today.

---

**Question:** A discussion on covenants suggested that the City had design criteria many years ago. What do the regulations say?

**Answer (J, B):** To the recollection of staff, there have never been any aesthetic design criteria in the Zoning Bylaw for new single infill house construction in the City of Richmond. Some Land Use Contracts had limited architectural guidelines.

**Answer (B):** The City currently has no development permit process for individual ‘infill housing’. Design guidelines are created based on a comprehensive development area. However, it is difficult to apply such guidelines to individual lots. As such, design guidelines that are created and/ or proposed will create additional time delays in the construction phase. Since time is measured economically, delays cost homebuilders large sums of money—homebuilders must pay taxes on the land while waiting for a permit. Barry suggested that design trends are changing, which will ultimately impact residents in areas of redevelopment.

---

**Comment:** The bylaws are used to control the depth of homes, but not necessarily massing. If the depth of allowable buildable area is controlled, the size of new house construction is constrained and will limit the length of sidewalls that visually affect adjacent properties.

**Comment:** Designers that create aesthetically undesirable houses are not present in the room.

**Comment (Lynda Terborg):** The City of Richmond needs rules and regulations to control the visual impact of single-family residences on the existing fabric of the City.

**Comment:** A design panel would be too time consuming, according to homebuilders. As such, homebuilders prefer access to prescriptive design guidelines that will speed up permit processing and reduce costs.

**Comment (Gursher Randhawa):** Homebuilders have identified already loopholes in the proposed amendments to zoning bylaw. Gursher suggests, that if he can find them design professionals are in a position to exploit these flaws because they are technically trained. As

such, the City needs to slow the amendment process down and consider every option in thorough detail. If the City moves too quickly, there will be consequences.

**Comment (Marty Gaetz):** Homebuilders invest a considerable amount of money in projects before becoming involved with the City. Homebuilders are requesting ample notice before any changes are made to the bylaw. The current limit on double height ceiling design is undesirable and is considered retroactive.

---

**Answer (J):** The City will try to work with transition time periods with homebuilders in order to implement fairly future changes to regulations.

---

**19:05—End of Meeting**



**Woo, Gavin**

---

**From:** Craig, Wayne  
**Sent:** Monday, 27 April 2015 08:58  
**To:** Woo, Gavin; Cooper, James  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing follow-up: Town Hall Meeting, Wednesday April 29th - 7pm

**FYI**

-----Original Message-----

From: [wrapd193@wrapd.org](mailto:wrapd193@wrapd.org) [<mailto:wrapd193@wrapd.org>]  
Sent: April-26-15 5:54 PM  
Subject: Public Hearing follow-up: Town Hall Meeting, Wednesday April 29th - 7pm

Hello WRAPd Subscribers,

Flowing out of the events of Monday April 20th's Public Hearing it has been clearly communicated that the public is asking for greater education and opportunities for informed citizen input into the character and shaping of Richmond's single family neighbourhoods.

An informed public is the best resource to hold City Council accountable to what was discussed on Monday April 20th.

This Wednesday (April 29) at 7pm WRAPd is hosting a Town Hall Meeting at Westwind School. We will be able to discuss some of the information presented at the Public Hearing but with ample time for community input and questions from residents.

Forward the invitation to your neighbors and friends in other neighbourhoods (LUC or Zoning) about having their voices heard.

Your participation is appreciated.

The story continues ...

<http://www.richmond-news.com/residents-contend-city-bylaws-being-flouted-by-megahome-developers-1.1831952>

[http://wrapd.org/PDF/Lynda'sPresentation\\_FULL001.pdf](http://wrapd.org/PDF/Lynda'sPresentation_FULL001.pdf)

<http://wrapd.org/PDF/JohnterBorgPublicHearingSubmission2015-04-20.pdf>

<http://wrapd.org/PDF/KathrynMcCrearyPublicHearingSubmission2015-04-20.pdf>


<http://wrapd.org/PDF/JamesStrilesky-LettertoMayorandCouncil2015-04-14.pdf>

[http://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/hearings/2015/042015\\_minutes.htm](http://www.richmond.ca/cityhall/council/agendas/hearings/2015/042015_minutes.htm)

*You are invited to a ...*

# **TOWN HALL MEETING on "MEGA HOUSES"**

## **Get Informed!**



pc: Joe Erceg

**Brodie, Malcolm**

---

**From:** jsmont@telus.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 22 April 2015 20:54  
**To:** Mayor and Councillors  
**Cc:** Brodie, Malcolm; Au, Chak; Dang, Derek; Day, Carol; Johnston, Ken; Loo, Alexa; McNulty, Bill; McPhail, Linda; Steves, Harold  
**Subject:** Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Mayor Brodie and Councillors

I am a life-long resident of Richmond, and have lived in our Westwind home since 1972, when we had it built for us. At the time, we were attracted by the prospect of living in a subdivision similar to the developers first two projects - Laurelwood and Maple Lane. There were no protective covenants regarding design principals, but thanks to the good taste and sense of discipline of the developer, a very pleasant community was completed, and remained so for over forty years.

As you heard at the Council meeting Monday night (April 20), our community is under serious threat as a result of a number of "mega houses" being built to designs that may or may not be quite legal according to the rules, but clearly are outside the intention of the of the zoning regulations.

By the end of the meeting on Monday, I was encouraged by the interest shown by the Mayor and Councillors in attendance, and sensed a shared concern for a need to address these issues. The Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9223, along with the additional considerations added during the meeting, are a good start. More study is required, but the sooner this can be completed, the better.

In the meantime, something must be done to stop the carnage. Builders will now rush to demolish and build prior to the changes taking effect. Further, the issue of the Land Use Contract properties has not even begun to be addressed. Even more pressure will be put on these properties once the above Zoning Amendments are in effect.

It seems quite clear these builders, and many buyers, simply don't care about what they are doing to our neighbourhoods, and they are not likely to be "persuaded" to change their practices. While these changes to the Zoning Regulations and Land Use Contracts are being studied and implemented, it is quite conceivable that another ten to fifteen percent of the existing housing stock could be razed. To prevent this, and until the these changes can be made, there are steps that can be taken.

The first, which is the least we can do, is to be much more rigorous in reviewing plans for these large houses prior to issuing building permits, and once issued, to apply the same tough approach to building inspections. I understand you feel that City staff are doing an adequate job, but given some of the examples we saw at the meeting this last Monday, clearly there are elements of the system that are broken.

The second thing we can do is to simply place a six or nine month moratorium on any further demolitions. This may seem extreme, but if we are really serious about the City's objective of preserving the character and desirability of our single family neighbourhoods, this will clearly demonstrate we are serious.

As I mentioned earlier, I was impressed with the nature of the discussion at the Monday meeting, and hope that a high priority will be placed on resolving these issues with the Zoning Bylaws and the Land Use Contracts.

Thank you,

John S. R. Montgomery

5880 Sandpiper Court, Richmond, BC V7E 3P7

2015-04-23 07:10

**Woo, Gavin**

---

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Thursday, 23 April 2015 15:55  
**To:** 'jsrmont@telus.net'  
**Subject:** RE: Zoning Bylaw Amendments

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of April 22, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Wayne Craig, Director of Development. If you have any questions or further concerns at this time, please call Mr. Craig at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Yours truly,

**Michelle Jansson**

**Manager, Legislative Services**

City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** [jsrmont@telus.net](mailto:jsrmont@telus.net) [<mailto:jsrmont@telus.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, 22 April 2015 9:06 PM

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Cc:** Brodie, Malcolm; Au, Chak; Dang, Derek; Day, Carol; Johnston, Ken; Loo, Alexa; McNulty, Bill; McPhail, Linda; Steves, Harold

**Subject:** Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Mayor Brodie and Councillors

I am a life-long resident of Richmond, and have lived in our Westwind home since 1972, when we had it built for us. At the time, we were attracted by the prospect of living in a subdivision similar to the developers first two projects - Laurelwood and Maple Lane. There were no protective covenants regarding design principals, but thanks to the good taste and sense of discipline of the developer, a very pleasant community was completed, and remained so for over forty years.

As you heard at the Council meeting Monday night (April 20), our community is under serious threat as a result of a number of "mega houses" being built to designs that may or may not be quite legal according to the rules, but clearly are outside the intention of the of the zoning regulations.

By the end of the meeting on Monday, I was encouraged by the interest shown by the Mayor and Councillors in attendance, and sensed a shared concern for a need to address these issues. The Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9223, along with the additional considerations added during the meeting, are a good start. More study is required, but the sooner this can be completed, the better.

In the meantime, something must be done to stop the carnage. Builders will now rush to demolish and build prior to the changes taking effect. Further, the issue of the Land Use Contract properties has not even begun to

be addressed. Even more pressure will be put on these properties once the above Zoning Amendments are in effect.

It seems quite clear these builders, and many buyers, simply don't care about what they are doing to our neighbourhoods, and they are not likely to be "persuaded" to change their practices. While these changes to the Zoning Regulations and Land Use Contracts are being studied and implemented, it is quite conceivable that another ten to fifteen percent of the existing housing stock could be razed. To prevent this, and until the these changes can be made, there are steps that can be taken.

The first, which is the least we can do, is to be much more rigorous in reviewing plans for these large houses prior to issuing building permits, and once issued, to apply the same tough approach to building inspections. I understand you feel that City staff are doing an adequate job, but given some of the examples we saw at the meeting this last Monday, clearly there are elements of the system that are broken.

The second thing we can do is to simply place a six or nine month moratorium on any further demolitions. This may seem extreme, but if we are really serious about the City's objective of preserving the character and desirability of our single family neighbourhoods, this will clearly demonstrate we are serious.

As I mentioned earlier, I was impressed with the nature of the discussion at the Monday meeting, and hope that a high priority will be placed on resolving these issues with the Zoning Bylaws and the Land Use Contracts.

Thank you,

John S. R. Montgomery

5880 Sandpiper Court, Richmond, BC V7E 3P7

Sent from Windows Mail

This recent letter (Richmond Review April 23 2015)  
to the editor is so true and the last part  
is referring to future changes that will have to occur if this  
troubled world is to survive. Politicians at this time period  
don't have the necessary wisdom of understanding to realize  
the deeper meaning of what is meant by future changes.

The current mantra of the world is materialism it is fueled by  
greed and mostly governed by incompetency.

Teopea  
Richmond BC  
May 7, 2015

# Elected Politicians not doing their job.

A6 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2015

■ **LETTERS** *to the Editor*

## City's sold out

Dear Editor,

The politicians who run the City of Richmond have sold out to property tax revenue greed.

Perfectly good, older homes are being torn down to be replaced by mostly over-sized homes that look out of place in the neighbourhood and out of the market price range for many families.

Developers have taken advantage of the weak mindedness of the politicians and have maximized the usable property space to where some lots are all house and paving stones. (Not good for the environment).

Three-story new homes should never have been allowed. It's a perfect example of politicians not taking their jobs seriously in protecting the best interests of neighbourhoods. They will defend their lack of oversight in this matter with wiggle room excuses.

Now, the politicians have allowed ultra-small two-storey towers to be built on the same property as the oversized home. More property tax revenue for the city but at what expense to the character of the neighbourhoods?

The two most pressing problems of this world, according to a recent UN study, are over population and over development. The Richmond city politicians have no true ethical understanding of what is meant by over development. They are part of the problem because their mindset has been influenced by the relentless pursuit of progress and development. Eventually, a new mindset has to take place, but it certainly won't happen with the current batch of politicians running the City of Richmond.

JG Jardey  
Richmond

City of

**RICHMOND**  
British Columbia

**Performance  
Grade**

**F**  
ailed

Public opinion is in agreement that the tax payer paid politicians have failed in providing for a common sense approach to long term community neighbourhood development planning and environmental concerns for continued neighbourhood development.

## **Richmond Public Hearing – May 20, 2015**

Richmond's new home building trends are for high ceilings, high stair wells to the second floor and high great rooms.

A house on Glacier Crescent near my parents house is shown in the picture. The great room is shown off the kitchen at the middle back of the house and the ceiling is significantly more than 16ft4in. You can see the max 16ft4in ceiling in the entrance to the house and compare it with the much higher ceiling over the railing looking down towards the great room.

Show picture 1

I went to another house on Glacier Crescent with an inspector from the City. The great room is off the kitchen in the middle back of the house. In this example, there was a dropped ceiling that dropped down to 16ft4in directly above the great room. The inspector told me that the ceiling height was dropped to satisfy the "height requirement".

But meeting the maximum storey height by construction of a false drop ceiling below the level of the roof structure contributes to greater massing!

Instead of a drop ceiling an arch or barrel ceiling could easily be constructed and still have the same impact on massing as the space taking up volume. As an aside, the builder, I was told, was only required to show one cross section in his submission and so this is the one he most likely presents.

I went to an open house for another new house at 9240 Chapmond Crescent which had a great room next to the kitchen at the middle back of the house like the other two properties mentioned. The real estate agent told me that the height of the ceilings was about 21ft.

I went to another house on Goldstream Place. It had ceilings, that were about 21ft high in the entrance, as well as the two front rooms and the great room off the kitchen.

Show Picture group 2



I have looked at many MLS pictures and the vast majority have great rooms.

**In conclusion, the vast majority of these houses have great rooms that have storeys that exceed 16'4".**

I did a study and searched all 93 houses on MLS in Richmond built since 2008 that had a value of \$1.8 million dollars and above.

I have prepared a spreadsheet, illustrating the relationship between finished floor area and permitted floor area as allowed by the lot size.

**insert word document**

**insert spreadsheet**

**In conclusion, Builders are maximizing the square footage of the houses they are building. Which begs the question, how can they maximize the allowable area of living space and still have these over height rooms?**

The double counting rule says that if the height of the floor exceeds 16'4" than it must be double counted as if there were two floors. This means that if the height of a storey is increased beyond 16'4", than the total floor area of the space needs to be subtracted from the maximum permitted area.

Since we confirmed the vast majority of these homes have great rooms the actual square footage of the house must be significantly lower than the maximum permitted area of the house. The maximum living area of these homes should be reduced by the area of these over height great rooms and other over height rooms.

Also, we confirmed the majority of these MLS listing all were built out to the maximum allowable floor area. The majority all of these houses were non nonconforming visually from the inside and out.

**There is a problem**

Walking my dog in my neighbourhood, a subcontractor allowed me to view one of the Goldstream houses under construction. I walked all the rooms in the house. Again from the second floor looking towards the front of the house I noted the same 16ft4in ceilings dropping down, in the rooms in either side of the foyer, and the great room. The drop in the ceiling was achieved by using large coffers. The coffers were about 5 feet in height at their maximum, in fact the full height of the storey was still about 21 feet.

I alerted City staff and an inspector was sent to take pictures of the ceiling. I requested to know the square footage of the house and he informed me that the actual size of the house was 4,000 square feet. The maximum calculated square footage of the house is 4,019 square feet. So apparently no deduction was made to the size of the house for these oversize rooms.

### **There is a problem**

I have been informed that Staff in the Building Approval Division review all house plans before a Building Permit is issued. All Building Permits issued by the City are reviewed to ensure compliance with the City's Zoning Bylaw and the BC Building Code. Any internal building area with a storey shown on the building permit drawings to be constructed at a height of more than 5 m (16.4 ft) has that area counted as if it is comprised of two floors for the purpose of determining the maximum floor area permitted.

## **There is a problem - it's not happening**

### **Conclusion**

- Enforce the Bylaw
- Stop taking ceiling measurement to false drop ceilings of any kind (barrel, back framed, drop,coffer)
- Require the builder to provide multiply cross sections of a house for review to the City.
- Get rid of 16'4" ceilings all together and change them to 12'1'.  
Result: This will stop new houses from making the leap from **16ft4inch ceilings to 21ft as the new normal.**

Kathryn McCreary, P.Eng.

## Calculation

### **Study**

- Looks at 93 houses built since 2008, and
- Houses on the market listed at \$1.8 million dollars or more asking price

### **Example Calculation: 7531 Glacier Crescent**

Maximum Floor Area permitted for Single Family Residential Zoning

- Based on total area of the lot
- Maximum Buildable Area = 55% on the first 5,000ft<sup>2</sup>, and  
30% on the remaining lot area  
=  $0.55 * 5000 + 0.30 * 3556$   
= 3,817 square feet  
Finished Floor Area  
= 3,807 square feet (MLS)

### **Sample Calculation:**

Ratio of Finished Floor Area / Maximum Permitted Buildable Area  
=  $3,817 / 3807$   
= 1.003

### **Conclusion:**

Average of 93 houses on the Market, on April 18, 2015

- Ratio = 1.004/1

Suggests Builders are maxing out on allowable square footage

### **Source Information:**


- <http://www.realtylink.org/>
- <http://www.bcassessment.ca>

This house has maxed out its FSR (floor space ratio).

This room has exceeded the maximum storey height and the square footage must be counted against the maximum buildable area.

The saleable area must be reduced by the same floor area as this room.


In the vast majority of new houses built in Richmond this section of the Zoning Bylaw is not being enforced.



## MLS Richmond Listings

**Date:** April 18, 2015  
**Price Range:** > \$1,800,000  
**Age:** Houses built after the year 2008  
**Source(s):** <http://www.realtylink.org>  
<http://www.bcassessment.ca>  
Real estate open houses  
**Author(s):** Kathryn McCreary P.Eng.  
John ter Borg B.Eng., MLWS, LEED AP

### Graph:











### Summary:















































New houses coming on the market in Richmond are being built to maximize 100% of the permitted floor area available.























The majority of new houses constructed in Richmond are in violation of the double height standard in the Zoning Bylaw.

These new houses in Richmond breaching the double height standard are not sacrificing walkable square footage as required by the Zoning Bylaw.

### Data:

Address		Age	Lot Area (ft2)	Actual Livable Area (ft2)	Maximum Permitted Area (ft2)	Ratio	Breach Double Height	MLS Image
9271 WELLMOND RD	1	4	7,200	3,623	3,410	1.06	?	
9220 WELLMOND RD	2	6	7,920	3,820	3,626	1.05	Y	
3560 FRANCIS RD	3	3	7,920	3,589	3,626	0.99	Y	
5520 CHEMAINUS DR	4	2	7,000	3,347	3,350	1.00	y	
8820 ST ALBANS RD	5	5	7,920	3,625	3,626	1.00	y	
3506 ULLSMORE AV	6	2	7,030	3,462	3,359	1.03	?	
8228 ELSMORE RD	7	3	7,100	3,378	3,380	1.00	y	
9091 WELLMOND RD	8	5	7,920	3,550	3,626	0.98	y	

9411 DESMOND RD	9	5	7,920	3,624	3,626	1.00	y	
9871 PARSONS RD	10	8	7,920	3,604	3,626	0.99	?	
10560 SOUTHDALE RD	11	4	8,118	3,700	3,685	1.00	y	
3240 SPRINGFIELD DR	12	2	6,996	3,961	3,349	1.18	?	
9611 BAKERVIEW DR	13	1	8,694	3,858	3,858	1.00	?/y	
7680 DAMPIER DR	14	1	7,074	3,367	3,372	1.00	?	
9500 PINEWELL CR	15	3	7,920	3,614	3,626	1.00	y	
9240 CHAPMOND CR	16	2	7,551	3,620	3,515	1.03	y	
3191 PLEASANT ST	17	6	5,940	3,042	3,032	1.00	No	
10311 AMETHYST AV	18	1	7,980	3,841	3,644	1.05	y	
3611 LAMOND AV	19	2	7,350	3,447	3,455	1.00	?	
3311 SPRINGTHORNE CT	20	0	6,699	3,370	3,260	1.03	y	
4911 WESTMINSTER HY	21	0	8,177	3,700	3,703	1.00	?/y	
8040 FAIRDELL CR	22	2	7,507	3,498	3,502	1.00	y	
4911 WESTMINSTER HY	23	0	8,172	3,700	3,702	1.00	y	
9740 BATES RD	24	6	6,717	3,241	3,265	0.99	n	
8328 BOWCOCK RD	25	6	8,554	3,766	3,816	0.99	No	
8751 ST. ALBANS RD	26	7	8,580	3,823	3,824	1.00	No	
4891 WESTMINSTER HY	27	0	7,937	3,629	3,631	1.00	?	
9720 HERBERT RD	28	8	7,994	3,646	3,648	1.00	?	
8180 SEAFAIR DR	29	3	7,484	3,490	3,495	1.00	N/?	
9180 WELLMOND RD	30	2	7,919	3,626	3,626	1.00	N/?	
4300 BLUNDELL RD	31	2	9,800	4,295	4,190	1.03	No	
9340 GORMOND RD	32	0	7,262	3,417	3,429	1.00	?/Y	
7660 RAILWAY AV	33	1	9,200	3,994	4,010	1.00	y/?	
7151 MONTANA RD	34	0	7,020	3,450	3,356	1.03	?	
5151 CALDERWOOD CR	35	4	9,207	4,010	4,012	1.00	No	
8800 ST. ALBANS RD	36	0	7,920	3,601	3,626	0.99	y	
9811 PINEWELL CR	37	4	14,777	5,300	5,683	0.93	y	
3500 NEWMORE AV	38	0	7,029	3,358	3,359	1.00	?	
7291 LINDSAY RD	39	1	8,323	3,750	3,747	1.00	y	
10120 LEONARD RD	40	2	8,844	3,907	3,903	1.00	y	
5291 LANCING RD	41	4	8,450	3,782	3,785	1.00	y	
4391 CORLESS RD	42	0	8,778	3,930	3,883	1.01	y	
8711 GARDEN CITY RD	43	3	11,818	4,667	4,796	0.97	y	
9131 DESMOND RD	44	4	7,920	3,595	3,626	0.99	?/y	
3480 FRANCIS RD	45	4	7,920	3,621	3,626	1.00	y	
3320 FRANCIS RD	46	0	7,907	3,622	3,622	1.00	?	
7511 AFTON DR	47	5	7,392	3,459	3,468	1.00	y	
11451 No. 2 Road	48	3	7,202	3,405	3,411	1.00	y	
9131 DIAMOND RD	49	5	8,120	3,737	3,686	1.01	y	
5491 CATHAY RD	50	2	7,854	3,631	3,606	1.01	y	
8191 CATHAY RD	51	1	7,500	3,507	3,500	1.00	y	
10226 BAMBERTON DR	52	1	6,480	3,337	3,194	1.04	?/y	
9120 WELLMOND RD	53	0	7,920	3,603	3,626	0.99	y	
6671 RIVERDALE DR	54	3	7,200	3,408	3,410	1.00	y	
7400 GRANDY RD	55	2	8,040	3,663	3,662	1.00	y	

5771 FRANCIS RD	56	8	10,758	4,690	4,477	1.05	y	
7328 BARKERVILLE CT	57	1	7,000	3,408	3,350	1.02	y	
4300 COLD FALL RD	58	2	9,240	4,024	4,022	1.00	y	
5851 MCCALLAN RD	59	4	8,640	3,811	3,842	0.99	y	
5100 WILLIAMS RD	60	0	10,890	4,500	4,517	1.00	?	
7480 CHELSEA RD	61	3	7,992	3,645	3,648	1.00	y	
9471 PINEWELL CR	62	1	7,955	3,750	3,637	1.03	y	
8531 BOWCOCK RD	63	4	10,688	4,196	4,456	0.94	?/y	
7891 GABRIOLA CR	64	0	8,063	3,658	3,669	1.00	y	
9760 BATES RD	65	0	6,801	3,340	3,290	1.02	y	
9740 GILHURST CR	66	3	9,378	4,015	4,063	0.99	y	
3531 SOLWAY DR	67	4	9,128	3,972	3,988	1.00	y	
8480 PIGOTT RD	68	6	9,768	4,158	4,180	0.99	y	
7900 BELAIR DR	69	5	8,841	3,790	3,902	0.97	y	
7580 REEDER RD	70	7	7,559	3,474	3,518	0.99	N	
7391 BATES RD	71	2	7,257	3,428	3,427	1.00	y	
4388 GRANVILLE AV	72	4	9,728	4,308	4,168	1.03	y	
8620 PIGOTT RD	73	4	8,828	3,885	3,898	1.00	?	
5760 LANGTREE AV	74	0	7,022	3,351	3,357	1.00	?	
7251 LISMER AV	75	2	7,000	3,450	3,350	1.03	?	
8511 CALDER RD	76	0	7,634	3,538	3,540	1.00	?	
5760 RIVERDALE DR	77	1	8,073	3,671	3,672	1.00	?	
6188 Sheridan Rd	78	3	8,580	3,820	3,824	1.00	y	
7520 AFTON DR	79	2	8,118	3,668	3,685	1.00	y	
5780 RIVERDALE DR	80	0	8,073	3,672	3,672	1.00	?/y	
4571 PENDLEBURY RD	81	2	8,910	3,922	3,923	1.00	?/y	
6031 MAPLE RD	82	3	9,243	4,008	4,023	1.00	?	
8880 COOPER RD	83	7	11,696	4,767	4,759	1.00	y	
3240 FRANCIS RD	84	5	7,920	3,428	3,626	0.95	?	
10920 BAMBERTON DR	85	0	8,475	3,717	3,793	0.98	?	
5891 MURCHISON RD	86	1	8,073	3,777	3,672	1.03	?	
7680 RAILWAY AV	87	0	10,147	4,307	4,294	1.00	?	
9620 PINEWELL CR	88	2	14,783	5,600	5,685	0.99	y	
7531 GLACIER CR	89	2	8,556	3,807	3,817	1.00	y	
7440 LUCAS RD	90	2	9,102	3,981	3,981	1.00	No	
7960 SUNNYMEDE CR	91	5	9,741	4,107	4,172	0.98	?	
7720 SUNNYHOLME CR	92	4	9,918	4,220	4,225	1.00	y	
10211 THIRLMERE DR	93	0	8,280	3,719	3,734	1.00	y	
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>2.7</b>	<b>8,354</b>	<b>3,766</b>	<b>3,756</b>	<b>1.004</b>		



**7531 Glacier Crescent (Back)**





















## 7900 Goldstream Place



**Woo, Gavin**

---

**Subject:** FW: Concern with overly large buildings on properties in the Westwind area

---

**From:** Patrick Hill [[mailto:pat\\_hill@telus.net](mailto:pat_hill@telus.net)]

**Sent:** Sunday, 19 April 2015 09:41

**To:** [inf@wrapd.org](mailto:inf@wrapd.org)

**Cc:** MayorandCouncillors

**Subject:** Concern with overly large buildings on properties in the Westwind area

I am personally concerned with the overly large new buildings, in some cases the height of 3 stores and covering the very edges of the properties – mega buildings – overlooking all other buildings in the area, they are often ugly (designed) and massive! I agree with your newsletter that the city must make the necessary changes to the zoning rules to prevent this, I am amazed that the city building department has not been more active in monitoring the effect of what they have permitted – is there no architect in the department? We have three massive houses one of which is a flat top box at the end of the court – maybe it is to be a bed & breakfast!

Changes have to made to bring the Westwind in line with what it was originally designed for, a community.

PS I will be out of town when the council meeting is held.

Patrick Hill

**5791 Bittern Court**

**Richmond**



**Woo, Gavin**

---

**Subject:** FW: Call to Action on MASSIVE houses

-----

-----Original Message-----

From: [info@wrapd.org](mailto:info@wrapd.org) [<mailto:info@wrapd.org>]

Sent: April-18-15 7:32 PM

Subject: Call to Action on MASSIVE houses

Thank you for your support on the MASSING of houses issue.

Public Hearing is Monday 7pm at Richmond City Hall.

City Council is not addressing height and MASSING on Zoning houses, nor will the LUC properties receive any relief from the proposed Bylaw Amendment.

Please plan to attend to share your concern.

I am sharing with you a message sent to the Mayor and Council of well written words from a Westwind neighbour....

I am a 40 year resident of Richmond. I have lived in Westwind for over 30 years. I have watched Richmond evolve into a diverse, cosmopolitan community under civic leadership that has generally been very responsive and wise in steering a course to maintain a vibrant, liveable and welcoming city community. However, I am very disappointed with how our civic leadership has handled the issue of Land Use Contracts and building/zoning bylaws and the negative impact this is having on the liveability and desirability of our established city neighbourhoods.

I am looking to our mayor and councillors to take the following action to reverse the disturbing trend of three story and MASSING homes which are destroying not only the nature of the Westwind planned community which I had bought into but also the fabric of our community and city.

More specifically I am looking for the mayor and council to make the following changes in:

Zoning

-reduce the double height provision in By-law 4.2 from 16.4 feet (5.0 m) to 12.1 feet (3.7 m) to bring us in line with our neighbouring cities and municipalities

-re-establish the measurement criteria pre 2008 to determine the maximum height of a house being built in an established community. Prior to 2008 the maximum height for a house was 29.5 feet. However an amendment in 2008 changed the measurement from the top of the roof peak to the mid-point of the roof permitting the true height to exceed 29.5 feet and climb to 34 feet and beyond. Aside from the questionable process used to implement this amendment, the policy review process promised to review the impact of these changes has never happened.

Land Use Contracts

-LUC properties need a moratorium before any more building permits are granted.

Redevelopment could continue under Zoning By-law 8500 rules or by replacement of the same

square foot livable area currently on the lot, whichever is larger. No more three story building permits should be granted until the problems with the LUC are resolved.  
-Double height provisions need to be reduced to 12 feet and stringently enforced

Over my four decades of working and living in Richmond I know many of you personally. I know you are caring, committed and hard working people. I hope you will focus on this issue and consider the future implications of delaying or not taking action on this important matter to preserve the nature of our neighbourhood and our Richmond community.

signed,  
WRAP'd Group



## Woo, Gavin

---

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Monday, 20 April 2015 10:20  
**To:** 'VICKI'  
**Subject:** RE: Monster House Next Door

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of April 17, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals. If you have any questions or further concerns at this time, please call Mr. Woo at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Yours truly,

**Michelle Jansson**  
**Manager, Legislative Services**  
City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** VICKI [<mailto:vicmail@shaw.ca>]  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 April 2015 8:05 PM  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** Monster House Next Door

Please read this and drive by the address  
I hope someone has the time to come and look at the house next door to me  
We are zoned LUC and I will be losing the sunshine and privacy of my home  
The excavators said, "Hey, your house just went up \$200,000.00 in value!"  
I said.. "I do not care!..This is my home not a real estate investment.."

The address is 10486 Canso Crescent  
My address is 10500 Canso Crescent  
The Monster House is South of me..  
That is where the sunshine comes from  
Now I will have a 26.5 ft. structure that exceeds my home by 40 ft.  
Most of my windows are on the back of the home  
This house will have side windows viewing into my home, patio and garden  
Yes, 40 ft. "longer" than my home....Half of my backyard..I have a 150 ft. deep lot by 40 ft. wide  
Thank you for reading this and I hope someone can take pictures before and after  
You have made my home a teardown due to the structure..  
Victoria Henderson

## Mayor and Councillors

**From:** Kathryn McCreary [kathrynmccreary@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 16 April 2015 7:42 PM  
**To:** Mayor and Councillors  
**Cc:** McPhail, Linda; Steves, Harold  
**Subject:** Maple Lane neighbourhood massive houses

**Categories:** 12-8360-01 - Permits - Building - General, 12-8060-20-9223 - To regulate half-storey in single family dwellings

<b>To Public Hearing</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	April 20/15
<b>Item #</b>	15
<b>Re:</b>	Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9223

Mayor and Councillors,

Following up on my concerns...

Last week I was on site with an inspector from the City to look into the ceiling heights in the new houses being built in our neighbourhood.

It was confirmed that the highest ceiling heights in the house were built to 16'4". But in one of the rooms the ceiling height had been dropped artificially to meet this height standard.

Walking through houses with the inspector and trades people and measuring from the top of the stairs I could see by looking towards the front of the house that 16'4" ceiling height came to just above my head.

Walking my dog in my neighbourhood a subcontractor allowed me to view another house at 7900 Goldstream Place.

I walked all the rooms in the house. Again from the second floor looking towards the front of the house I noticed the same 16'4" ceilings dropping down.

The drop in the ceiling was achieved by using large coffers. The coffers were about 5 feet in height at their maximum.

This describes a 5' + 16'4" = 21'4" room.

I alerted City staff and an inspector was sent to take pictures of the ceiling. A City staff person said we would have an intelligent conversation about this matter. I requested to know the square footage of the house. Staff said that he would pull the drawings to see if the area associated with the 21 foot high ceilings had indeed been double counted.

Could you please ensure that this has been addressed by the April 20th Public Hearing date.

Thank you,

Kathryn

CityClerk

From: Graham Taylor [grahamtaylor1954@yahoo.ca]  
Sent: April 17, 2015 11:48  
To: CityClerk  
Subject: Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9223

Categories: 12-8060-20-009223

To Public Hearing	
Date:	April 20/15
Item #	5
Re:	Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9223

		INT
	DN	
	MJ	
	DB	

Please accept this email as my submission to the public hearing scheduled for April 20. In my view the proposed amendment does not go far enough. The staff report referral motion refers to concerns related to overall building height. The proposed amendment does nothing to deal with building height. I do not know exactly when the roof allowance was raised to 29.5 feet but that was a mistake. As you know, since then most, if not all, new buildings have been built to the maximum allowance. These new buildings block the sun, detract from views and infringe privacy. I am going to try to enclose a picture of the house built to the south of me with this email. It is the view from my second-story kitchen looking south.

To my mind, the current zoning allows the houses to be too tall, too big and too close to its neighbours.

I suspect we are too far gone to erase all these mistakes but as the amendment to the roof height limit is fairly recent, I believe you should go back to the old limits.


I note to staff report says you are going to consult with the building associations before the public hearing. I hope you will also consider the views of the public, the people that live in the houses next to the new houses.

I also note that the staff report states that homebuilders using the existing regulations build to the fullest which reflects current market land and construction prices. that sentence has it backwards. It is the maximum build that creates the land prices.

I would like council to consider what social good is being accomplished by allowing these new bigger houses. You have a plot of land that is supposedly worth \$1 million. Someone buys it, puts up a bigger house and then sells it for \$2 million. However, it is still just a single-family dwelling so all that has been done is that the price of a house has doubled. What is good about that?

Yours truly,  
Graham Taylor  
8571 Fairhurst Rd.

Sent from my iPhone.



CityClerk


**From:** Graham Taylor [grahamtaylor1954@yahoo.ca]  
**Sent:** April 17, 2015 13:53  
**To:** CityClerk  
**Subject:** Bylaw submission  
**Attachments:** IMG\_0268.JPG; ATT00001.txt; IMG\_0269.JPG; ATT00002.txt

<b>To Public Hearing</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Item #</b>	
<b>Re:</b>	

		INT
	DW	
	MI	
	DB	

Please accept these photos as part of the submission of Graham Taylor emailed earlier. Thank you









## Woo, Gavin

---

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Friday, 17 April 2015 09:39  
**To:** 'Kathryn McCreary'  
**Subject:** RE: Maple Lane neighbourhood massive houses

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of April 16, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals. If you have any questions or further concerns at this time, please call Mr. Woo at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Yours truly,

**Michelle Jansson**

**Manager, Legislative Services**

City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** Kathryn McCreary [<mailto:kathrynmccreary@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, 16 April 2015 7:42 PM

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Cc:** McPhail, Linda; Steves, Harold

**Subject:** Maple Lane neighbourhood massive houses

Mayor and Councillors,

Following up on my concerns...

Last week I was on site with an inspector from the City to look into the ceiling heights in the new houses being built in our neighbourhood.

It was confirmed that the highest ceiling heights in the house were built to 16'4". But in one of the rooms the ceiling height had been dropped artificially to meet this height standard.

Walking through houses with the inspector and trades people and measuring from the top of the stairs I could see by looking towards the front of the house that 16'4" ceiling height came to just above my head.

Walking my dog in my neighbourhood a subcontractor allowed me to view another house at 7900 Goldstream Place.

I walked all the rooms in the house. Again from the second floor looking towards the front of the house I noticed the same 16'4" ceilings dropping down.

The drop in the ceiling was achieved by using large coffers. The coffers were about 5 feet in height at their maximum.

This describes a 5' + 16'4" = 21'4" room.

I alerted City staff and an inspector was sent to take pictures of the ceiling. A City staff person said we would have an intelligent conversation about this matter. I requested to know the square footage of the house. Staff said that he would pull the drawings to see if the area associated with the 21 foot high ceilings had indeed been double counted.

Could you please ensure that this has been addressed by the April 20th Public Hearing date.

Thank you,

Kathryn



---

**Subject:** FW: LUC 036 Pintail  
**Attachments:** WESTWIND - LUC 036 - RD22094.pdf; ATT00135.htm

**From:**  
**Date:** February 3, 2015 at 9:23:10 PM PST  
**To:**

**Subject:** Fwd: LUC 036 Pintail

Hey \*\*\*\*,

This is what I got from my realtor. I'm good to share this with you but she asked me to mention that you should do your own due diligence at the city and mentioned that they will give you all the info at the counter. Of course the city doesn't want you to build 7900 sq feet. Lol

I want to make sure you check stuff on your own and make sure you're happy with the pintail lot and it's LUC conditions as I'm not familiar with this stuff and can only pass on what info I have gathered. I want you to be comfortable with the purchase based on your comfort level with the LUC stuff and not what I tell you as I don't represent the seller I'm just a guy putting two parties together. I should get paid though lol

Cheers

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Lynda Terborg" <[ltterborg@shaw.ca](mailto:ltterborg@shaw.ca)>  
**Date:** February 3, 2015 at 6:41:26 PM PST  
**To:**  
**Subject:** LUC 036 Pintail

Hio \*\*\*\*... here is a copy of the LUC... no specific reference to lot coverage percentage so default is back to original by-law ... most probably 40% or 33 % depends how the folks at the city interpret... "and amendments thereto"... some are using date of lot creation and others are using last allowable before by-law was repealed... either way a big lot and a super big rebuild.... as you see by the sales (hummingbird and Woodpecker) the spring market is heating up!... how much are they going to pay???

Cheers, Lyn

**Lynda Terborg**  
Personal Real Estate Corporation  
Re/Max Westcoast  
Cel: 604-250-8676  
Email: [LTterborg@shaw.ca](mailto:LTterborg@shaw.ca)

## Woo, Gavin

---

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Friday, 01 May 2015 10:18  
**To:** 'Robbie Sharda'  
**Subject:** RE: Concerned Resident

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of May 1, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals. If you have any questions or further concerns at this time, please call Mr. Woo at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to make your views known.

Yours truly,

Michelle Jansson

Manager, Legislative Services

City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** Robbie Sharda [mailto:[robbiesharda@hotmail.com](mailto:robbiesharda@hotmail.com)]

**Sent:** Friday, 01 May 2015 1:10 AM

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Cc:** AdministratorsOffice

**Subject:** Concerned Resident

**Importance:** High

Hello Mayor Brodie and fellow councillor members,

My name is Robbie Sharda, I live at 11531 Pintail Drive, Westwind, Richmond. I have been a resident of this city for my entire life, born in Vancouver but my family moved here when I was 4 months old. I have grown up in this city and have seen this city change over the last 36 years of my life and over the past 8 years I have been a part of this change. I own a residential development company and have truly enjoyed working with the city in developing new homes for families throughout Richmond. I have completed 32 new homes over the last 8 years and hope to continue to grow my business with this city. The reason for this email is concerning, as a developer it has come to my attention that the City of Richmond is making some drastic changes without sufficient notice to those who will be affected. The movement to amend a certain bylaw has been initiated and pursued by a small group of residents from the Westwind area. This group alleges that they have issues or concerns with LUC lots and also "mega homes" due to their massing. I participated in a developers meeting today at City Hall and in that meeting Gavin Woo (Sr. manager Building Department) made a statement that raised great concern with me and every other developers in the room. We were informed that as of April 21, 2015, all plans that are currently being reviewed in the building department, will have to comply to the 16.4 ft unclear Bylaw and that moving forward all plans being submitted should also comply to this rule.

My concern is not entirely about the changes to the rule itself, rather I am concerned that we have not been given sufficient notice. Consequently, many of us will have to pay high fees to comply to this new rule despite

the fact that we have already submitted the plans. Additionally, I have recently signed on 3 new contracts based on homes viewed by these clients that would fall under the old but unclear bylaw. The clients have requested that I build them a similar home, a condition to which I have already agreed and have already commenced the drawings and taken deposits from them so I can proceed with the application to the city. In one of these cases, I have already submitted drawings to my engineer. I have major concerns with having to inform these clients that I cannot deliver the home that has been promised because the City of Richmond has surreptitiously changed a ruling that has been in place for a long time. I feel that this is unacceptable. I am concerned about the legal ramifications that may arise as a result of a breach of contract due to this Bylaw change. I will be forced to retain legal support to be reimbursed for any losses I have incurred as a result of this change.

There can be a resolution to this issue. I feel that builders/ developers in Richmond should be provided a reasonable date in the future for a more seamless transition to this new unclear Bylaw to take place. As I stated earlier, my concern is not with the 16.4 ft rule, rather it is the manner in which the rule was ushered in-without consultation and sufficient notice. Over the last 8 years of my residential home building experience in Richmond, there has been a set precedence in which it is acceptable for the bottom of the ceiling to meet the top of the wall at 16.4ft, we are considered compliant and within the parameters of the Bylaw. Nowhere in the Bylaw does it state that trusses cannot be in alignment with the rest of the backyard roofline. Furthermore, there are no limitations to the use of the dead space between the bottom of the trusses to the top of the 16.4 ft ceiling within the wording of the Bylaw. It is this dead space that is used to create a decorative space with aesthetic value only. A group which makes up a small minority of the whole of Richmond has raised concerns and suddenly the Bylaw is subject to this abrupt change. I am confused and dismayed.

Richmond is a really unique place to live. I am fortunate to be able to raise my family in a city where the voice of the entire population is heard before decisions to make major changes are made. I trust that this central tenet of our city will go unchanged simply because the squeaky wheel gets the grease. I have listened to the worries voiced by my few concerned neighbours at the Town Hall meeting held at Westwind Elementary on April 29th, 2015 and they appeared to have a preoccupation with comparing Richmond, to Vancouver, Surrey, and Burnaby in regards to lowering the ceiling height limit to 12.1 ft. Bear in mind, the people who attempt to make these comparisons are comparing apples to oranges. We cannot build below ground as a result of our geographical uniqueness. Simply put, we are not Vancouver, Surrey or Burnaby, we are Richmond. We are a city that is known to preserve our agricultural land, a city that thrives on a pluralism of ideas and, yes-a city that is known for elegant, luxury homes. I am invested in Richmond, not just with my money but with my heart. Richmond must continue to shine amongst other cities. I trust you will bring your attention to my concerns given that I too am a tax paying, voting resident of Richmond who has resided here for nearly four decades.

Sincerely,

Robbie Sharda  
[www.infinityliving.ca](http://www.infinityliving.ca)  
Design Build Manage

BOB & ELIZABETH HARDACRE  
5391 WOODPECKER DRIVE  
RICHMOND, BC  
V7E 5P4

April 30, 2015

RE: Massive Houses, Enforcement of the Zoning Bylaw and Land Use Contracts

Dear Councillor:

As Richmond residents for 35 years, we are disturbed by increasingly unconstrained residential development in our community that has resulted in homes that dwarf their neighbours, impede sunlight, alter drainage patterns and eliminate privacy. The massive faces of these homes around their entire perimeters have significantly altered the characters and livability of Richmond neighbourhoods.

Our own neighbourhood, Westwind, is governed by a Land Use Contract (LUC) that was dismembered in 1989 yet remains in effect. Due to legal uncertainty, properties in our area are particularly vulnerable to redevelopment and construction of massive homes that far exceed the limits of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw. In Westwind, it is permissible to build a home up to 39 feet high instead of the maximum 29.5 feet height allowed for properties elsewhere in Richmond governed solely by the Zoning Bylaw.

But we are most indignant to learn that City officials have been remiss in the application of existing zoning requirements, and have allowed many new homes to exceed the maximum 16.4 interior height restriction dictated by current zoning regulations, without imposing the "double height - double count" requirement that is crucial for the determination of the permissible area of the home. Neighbouring communities in the Lower Mainland, specifically Vancouver, Surrey and Burnaby, have a much lower "double height - double count" requirement (12.1 feet) which makes the failure of City officials to enforce Richmond's already over-generous allowance even more egregious.

- We urge Council to direct City officials to begin consistent enforcement of the "double height - double count" requirement immediately.
- Furthermore, we demand immediate action to resolve the legal limbo of Land Use Contracts by the proactive termination of all LUCs by Richmond. This will permit and expedite the consistent application of the Zoning Bylaw, such as the maximum building height of residential homes to 29.5 feet, a measurement that we believe should be taken from grade to the top of the highest peak of the structure. (This is not the case currently).
- We urge you to investigate adjustments to the Zoning Bylaw that will reduce the massive exteriors of new homes that impact nearby homes and alter the streetscape significantly. For example, we believe that reduction of the "double height - double count" standard for interior heights in the Zoning Bylaw to 12.1 feet is a useful regulatory tool. Double height measurements should be taken from ground level to the highest point of the interior ceiling vault. Reducing the permitted interior area will decrease massive exterior appearances of new homes by altering room, staircase and entrance configurations, reducing the height of exterior walls and reducing or eliminating excessively high vaults, domes, false ceilings and inordinately tall windows.

We are not opposed to redevelopment, nor to changing styles and tastes not in keeping with our own. We are opposed to City officials who do not enforce existing zoning rules consistently. We are opposed to current measurements that permit construction of far too tall and far too big homes that directly impact the homes around them. We are opposed to Council's failure to bring in consistent regulations by dragging its feet on the termination of existing LUCs. Meanwhile, many more Richmond homes become bulldozer bait for developers. Councillors and bureaucrats have been listening to the voices of developers, architects and builders and not to those of homeowners. We want to be heard.

We want to hear your voice too. Where do you stand on the issues we have raised? What are you doing to ensure existing regulations are enforced? How do you intend to bring consistency to the zoning regulations? When will you terminate all Land Use Contracts in Richmond? How will you engage, involve and inform Richmond homeowners on these issues?

Yours truly,



Bob Hardacre



Elizabeth Hardacre

Cc:

Mayor Malcolm Brodie

Councillor Derek Dang

Councillor Bill McNulty

Councillor Harold Steves

Councillor Ken Johnston

Councillor Chak Kwong Au

Councillor Linda McPhail

Councillor Carol Day

Councillor Alexa Loo

Westwind Ratepayer Association for Positive Development (WRAPd)

## Woo, Gavin

---

**From:** Building  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 19 May 2015 10:50  
**To:** Jaggs, Gordon; Caravan, Bob; Nishi, Ernie  
**Cc:** Woo, Gavin  
**Subject:** FW: City of Richmond BC - Report Problem or Request a Service - Case [0515-BD-CS-E-005447] Received

F Y I and/or action. Laura

---

**From:** [donotreply@richmond.ca](mailto:donotreply@richmond.ca) [<mailto:donotreply@richmond.ca>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:04 AM  
**To:** Building  
**Subject:** City of Richmond BC - Report Problem or Request a Service - Case [0515-BD-CS-E-005447] Received



**Attention: Administrator**

A problem report or service request has been submitted through the City of Richmond online Feedback Form. Below is the information which was provided by the person making the report.

### Report a Problem - Request a Service

**Category:** Building & Construction Sites

**Sub Category:** Other

**Message:**

We are the owners of 6271 Goldsmith Drive. Currently there are lots of new houses construction in our neighborhood. Among all, the one behind us (now changed to 10200 Addison Street) is the most awful one. We wonder how the City can allow a 3-storey monster house to be built to intrude the privacy of the neighbours as well as to ruin the uniqueness.

We noticed yesterday, that the house beside us (6291 Goldsmith Drive) is listed (and probably sold and to be pulled down as we saw people coming by and discussing in front of that house). We strongly request the followings:

1. The tree between our house and their house NOT to be cut down;
2. Now we have a kitchen window and skylight window on the east side. The to-be-built house SHOULD NOT block the sunlight going through these windows;
3. NO MORE 3-storey houses in our neighbourhood.
4. NO constructions early in the morning or during weekends.

**Location:**

Goldsmith Dr and Addison St

**Uploaded Files:**

**Personal Information:**

Paul Ip and Doris Lau  
6271 Goldsmith Drive  
Richmond  
V7E4G6  
604-270-1028  
604-838-3869

[dorislau66@hotmail.com](mailto:dorislau66@hotmail.com)

Preferred Contact Method: Email

**Tech Information:**

Submitted By: 199.175.130.61

Submitted On: May 19, 2015 10:04 AM

[Click Here](#) to open this message in the case management system. You should immediately update the case status either to Received to leave the case open for further follow-up, or select the appropriate status based on your activity and work protocols. Click Save to generate the standard received message to the customer, add any additional comments you wish to and click Save & Send Email. Close the browser window to exit.

**Woo, Gavin**

---

**Subject:** FW: Westwind Ratepayer Association - Real Motivations?  
**Attachments:** DOC004.pdf

---

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Thursday, 30 April 2015 14:55  
**To:** 'William Cooke'  
**Subject:** RE: Westwind Ratepayer Association - Real Motivations?

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of April 30, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors, in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

Thank you again for taking the time to contact Richmond City Council.

Yours truly,

**Michelle Jansson**  
**Manager, Legislative Services**  
City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** William Cooke [<mailto:wcooke604@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 30 April 2015 08:47  
**To:** [gwood@richmond-news.com](mailto:gwood@richmond-news.com); MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** Westwind Ratepayer Association - Real Motivations?

Hi Graeme & Mayor & Councillors:

I attended the town hall at the Westwind school last night. At this meeting, it was interesting because it seems that Lynda Terborg spoke against land use contracts and "monster houses on steroids", citing that they are bad for privacy, sunshine, and the community. One speaker asked her about the impact on land values. She did not have a direct answer to this. However one must question her motivations. A speaker at the end presented a letter (attached), where she is telling a potential buyer of a property that a "super big rebuild" is possible on the property -- promoting the lot on the merits of the build ability.

I believe that the city is doing a fine job. The city makes the bylaws, and can interpret them as they deem reasonable. I do not have any concern with any zoning, or LUC issues. I am of the mindset that if one does not like living in the city, then one should move elsewhere. I find it interesting how people say Surrey Burnaby Vancouver have different ceiling height restrictions -- but these are areas which allow basements. Also, areas such as Coquitlam allow much larger houses than Richmond as well. Obviously people are building and buying these houses, so there is a demand. On a square footage per lot size ratio, Burnaby actually allows flat 60% (up to 4700sq house) -- which is more generous than Richmond. Vancouver allows 70% (also more generous than Richmond). Every city is different.

Thank-you,



**Woo, Gavin**

---

**Subject:** FW: April 20th Councillors - Double Height Referral to Staff

**From:**

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** May-05-15 10:14 AM  
**To:** 'Bradley Dore'  
**Subject:** RE: April 20th Councillors - Double Height Referral to Staff

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your email of May 3, 2015 to the Mayor and Councillors; in connection with the above matter, a copy of which has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor for their information.

In addition, your email has been referred to Wayne Craig, Director of Development. If you have any questions or further comments at this time, please call Mr. Craig at 604.276.4000.

Thank you again for taking the time to contact Richmond City Council.

Yours truly,

**Michelle Jansson**  
**Manager, Legislative Services**  
City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [mjansson@richmond.ca](mailto:mjansson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** Bradley Dore [<mailto:brad.dore@icloud.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 03 May 2015 17:30  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Cc:** Sophie 911 Lin  
**Subject:** April 20th Councillors - Double Height Referral to Staff

At the April 20th Council meeting a referral was made back to staff about the "double height" clause and the massing of single family and two family dwellings. Mayor Malcolm Brodie asked at the meeting that there be input from home designer and architects.

I believe I have valuable technical knowledge that could assist staff and council moving forward. I split my time between documenting & designing residences in the greater vancouver area. The documentation part of my work provides great insight into how other designers and builders have interpreted and had designs approved in cities such as Vancouver, Richmond, Burnaby, Surrey, etc. In my design work I am then challenged to understand what can be designed under the different zoning bylaws.

Though the majority of my design work is done for submissions to the city of Vancouver, I am a long term term Richmond resident, my grandfather was born here in Richmond, I attended McKay Elementary & Burnett Secondary way back when and currently reside here in Richmond. I would like to help residential development

in Richmond balance the benefits of a strong healthy efficient residential real estate market, against the long term livability of the current and future residents of the community.

LinkedIn Profile

Brad Doré  
Residential Designer &  
Building Technologist  
604.782.8240



## Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 Amendment Bylaw 9249 (Building Height and Massing Regulations)

The Council of the City of Richmond, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 [Use and Term Definitions] by:

- a) adding the following definition of “**height, ceiling**”, in alphabetical order:

“**Height, ceiling** means the top of the finished floor of a **storey** to the underside of the floor joist or underside of roof joist or underside of the bottom chord of a structural truss above that **storey**.”

- b) deleting the definition of **Height, building** in its entirety and substituting the following:

“**Height, building** means the vertical distance between **finished site grade** and:

- a) for **single detached housing** with 2 and **half (½) storeys** having a roof pitch greater than 4-to-12 and not exceeding a roof pitch of 12-to-12, the mid-point between the bottom of the **eave** line and ridge of a roof, provided that the ridge of the roof is not more than 1.5 m above the mid-point; and
- b) for all other **buildings**, the highest point of the **building**, whether such **building** has a flat roof, pitched roof or more than one type of roof.”

- c) deleting the definition of **Residential vertical lot width envelope** and substituting the following:

“**Residential vertical lot width envelope** means the vertical envelope within which a **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing** must be contained, as calculated in accordance with Section 4.18”

2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 4.3 [Calculation of Density in Single Detached Housing and Two-Unit Housing Zones] by:

- (a) deleting Section 4.3.1(c) in its entirety and marking it as “Repealed.”; and

- (b) adding the following after Section 4.3.1:

“4.3.2 Any portion of **floor area** in a **principal building** with a **ceiling height** which exceeds 3.7 m shall be considered to comprise two floors and shall be measured as such for the purposes of calculating **density** in all **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing**, except that, subject to Section 4.3.3, the following **floor area** shall be considered to comprise one floor:


- a) a maximum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> of **floor area** with a **ceiling height** which exceeds 3.7 m, provided such **floor area** is exclusively for interior entry and staircase purposes.

4.3.3 If the **floor area** to be calculated in accordance with the exception in subsection 4.3.2(a) is located on the **first storey**, the exterior wall of the **first storey** which faces the **interior side yard** and **rear yard**, as measured from finished floor to the bottom of the eave, must be no higher than 3.7 m.”

3. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by adding the following after Section 4.17:

“4.18.1 The **residential vertical lot width envelope** of a **lot** in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing** shall be calculated in accordance with Sections 4.18.2 to 4.18.4.


4.18.2 For a **lot** with a **lot width** that is 10.0 m or less, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of 45° from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




(A) When lot width is 10.0 m or less

4.18.3 For a **lot** with a **lot width** that is greater than 10.0 m but less than 18.0 m:

- a) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of  $45^\circ$  from the top of the vertical 5.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




- b) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two and half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of  $30^\circ$  from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




4.18.4 For a lot with a lot width that is 18.0 m or greater:

- a) for single detached housing and two-unit housing with two storeys, the residential vertical lot width envelope shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each side lot line, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the finished site grade, and then extending inward (horizontally) by 0.6 m and upward (vertically) by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an angle of 30° from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



- b) for single detached housing and two-unit housing with two and half (½) storeys, the residential vertical lot width envelope shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each side lot line, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the finished site grade, and then extending inward by 0.6 m and upward by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an

angle of  $30^{\circ}$  from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



4. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 and substituting the following:

“4.7.7 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and
- the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

4.7.8 Repealed”

5. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4 and substituting the following:

“4.8.3 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and

- c) the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

#### 4.8.4 Repealed”

6. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsection 4.14.4 and substituting the following:

“4.14.4 Except as set-out in 4.14.4(a) to (c) below or otherwise specified in a **zone**, the **accessory building** or **accessory structures** shall not be higher than the permitted **height** of the **principal building** in that **zone**. The following apply to the **height** of **accessory buildings** in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** and **town housing**:

- a) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 3.0 m measured from **finished site grade** to the roof ridge for a detached **accessory building** with a pitched roof, and 2.5 m for a detached **accessory building** with a flat roof;
- b) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 4.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for an **accessory building** with a pitched roof, and 3.0 m for an **accessory building** with a flat roof; and
- c) the maximum **height** for an attached **garage** constructed as part of a **principal building** is 6.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for a **garage** with a pitched roof, and 4.5 m for a **garage** with a flat roof.”

7. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.1 [Single Detached (RS1/A-H, J-K; RS2/A-H, J-K)] by deleting subsection 8.1.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.

8. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.2 [Compact Single Detached (RC1, RC2)] by:

- a) deleting subsections 8.2.6.5 and marking it “Repealed.”; and
- b) deleting subsection 8.2.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”.

9. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.3 [Coach Houses (RCH, RCH1)] by:

- a) deleting Section 8.3.7.6 in its entirety and substituting the following:

“6. The maximum **height** for an **accessory building** containing a **coach house** shall be:

- a) in the RCH **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 7.4 m, whichever is less, measured to the roof ridge; and



- b) in the RCH1 **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 6.0 m above the highest elevation of the crown of the **abutting lane** measured to the roof ridge, whichever is less.”
10. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.4 [Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1, RD2)] by deleting subsection 8.4.7.3 and marking it “Repealed.”.
  11. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.13 [Residential Child Care (RCC)] by deleting subsection 8.13.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.
  12. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.14 [Single Detached with Granny Flat or Coach House – Edgemere (RE1)] by deleting subsection 8.14.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”
  13. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9265”**.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

_____	CITY OF RICHMOND
_____	
_____	APPROVED by <i>GW</i> <i>RL</i>
_____	APPROVED by Director or Solicitor <i>as</i>
_____	

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 9249 (Building Height and Massing Regulations)**

The Council of the City of Richmond, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 [Use and Term Definitions] by:

- a) adding the following definition of “**height, ceiling**”, in alphabetical order:

“**Height, ceiling** means the top of the finished floor of a **storey** to the underside of the floor joist or underside of roof joist or underside of the bottom chord of a structural truss above that **storey**.”

- b) deleting the definition of **Height, building** in its entirety and substituting the following:

“**Height, building** means the vertical distance between **finished site grade** and:

- a) for **single detached housing** with 2 and half (½) **storeys** having a roof pitch greater than 4-to-12 and not exceeding a roof pitch of 12-to-12, the mid-point between the bottom of the **eave** line and ridge of a roof, provided that the ridge of the roof is not more than 1.5 m above the mid-point; and
- b) for all other **buildings**, the highest point of the **building**, whether such **building** has a flat roof, pitched roof or more than one type of roof.”

- c) deleting the definition of **Residential vertical lot width envelope** and substituting the following:

“**Residential vertical lot width envelope** means the vertical envelope within which a **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing** must be contained, as calculated in accordance with Section 4.18”

2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 4.3 [Calculation of Density in Single Detached Housing and Two-Unit Housing Zones] by:

- (a) deleting Section 4.3.1(c) in its entirety and marking it as “Repealed.”; and

- (b) adding the following after Section 4.3.1:

“4.3.2 Any portion of **floor area** in a **principal building** with a **ceiling height** which

exceeds 5.0 m shall be considered to comprise two floors and shall be measured as such for the purposes of calculating **density** in all **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing**, except that, subject to Section 4.3.3, the following **floor area** shall be considered to comprise one floor:


- a) a maximum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> of **floor area** with a **ceiling height** which exceeds 5.0 m, provided such **floor area** is exclusively for interior entry and staircase purposes.

4.3.3 If the **floor area** to be calculated in accordance with the exception in subsection 4.3.2(a) is located on the **first storey**, the exterior wall of the **first storey** which faces the **interior side yard** and **rear yard**, as measured from finished floor to the bottom of the eave, must be no higher than 3.7 m.”

3. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by adding the following after Section 4.17:

“4.18.1 The **residential vertical lot width envelope** of a lot in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing** shall be calculated in accordance with Sections 4.18.2 to 4.18.4.


4.18.2 For a lot with a **lot width** that is 10.0 m or less, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of 45° from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




4.18.3 For a lot with a **lot width** that is greater than 10.0 m but less than 18.0 m:

- a) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two storeys, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending

inward and upward at an angle of  $45^\circ$  from the top of the vertical 5.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




- b) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two and half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) storeys, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of  $30^\circ$  from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




4.18.4 For a **lot** with a **lot width** that is 18.0 m or greater:

- a) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two storeys, the

**residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward (horizontally) by 0.6 m and upward (vertically) by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an angle of  $30^\circ$  from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



- b) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two and half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward by 0.6 m and upward by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an angle of  $30^\circ$  from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



4. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 and substituting the following:

“4.7.7 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- a) the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- b) the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and
- c) the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

4.7.8 Repealed”

5. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4 and substituting the following:

“4.8.3 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- a) the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- b) the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and
- c) the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

4.8.4 Repealed”

6. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsection 4.14.4 and substituting the following:

“4.14.4 Except as set-out in 4.14.4(a) to (c) below or otherwise specified in a **zone**, the **accessory building** or **accessory structures** shall not be higher than the permitted **height** of the **principal building** in that **zone**. The following apply to the **height** of **accessory buildings** in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** and **town housing**:

- a) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 3.0 m measured from **finished site grade** to the roof ridge for a detached **accessory building** with a pitched roof, and 2.5 m for a detached **accessory building** with a flat roof;
- b) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 4.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for an **accessory**

**building** with a pitched roof, and 3.0 m for an **accessory building** with a flat roof; and

- c) the maximum **height** for an attached **garage** constructed as part of a **principal building** is 6.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for a **garage** with a pitched roof, and 4.5 m for a **garage** with a flat roof.”

7. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.1 [Single Detached (RS1/A-H, J-K; RS2/A-H, J-K)] by deleting subsection 8.1.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.
8. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.2 [Compact Single Detached (RC1, RC2)] by:
  - a) deleting subsections 8.2.6.5 and marking it “Repealed.”; and
  - b) deleting subsection 8.2.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”.
9. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.3 [Coach Houses (RCH, RCH1)] by:
  - a) deleting Section 8.3.7.6 in its entirety and substituting the following:
    - “6. The maximum **height** for an **accessory building** containing a **coach house** shall be:
      - a) in the RCH **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 7.4 m, whichever is less, measured to the roof ridge; and
      - b) in the RCH1 **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 6.0 m above the highest elevation of the crown of the **abutting lane** measured to the roof ridge, whichever is less.”
10. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.4 [Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1, RD2)] by deleting subsection 8.4.7.3 and marking it “Repealed.”.
11. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.13 [Residential Child Care (RCC)] by deleting subsection 8.13.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.
12. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.14 [Single Detached with Granny Flat or Coach House – Edgemere (RE1)] by deleting subsection 8.14.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”.
13. This Bylaw may be cited as “**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9249**”.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

---

---

---

---

---

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by <i>cw</i> <i>hk</i>
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor <i>hy</i>

---

MAYOR

---

CORPORATE OFFICER





**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500,  
Amendment Bylaw 9249  
(Building Height and Massing Regulations)**

The Council of the City of Richmond, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 3.4 [Use and Term Definitions] by:

- (a) adding the following definition of **“height, ceiling”**, in alphabetical order:

<b>“Height, ceiling</b>	means the top of the finished floor of a <b>storey</b> to the underside of the floor joist or underside of roof joist or underside of the bottom chord of a structural truss above that <b>storey.</b> ”
-------------------------	--

- (b) deleting the definition of **Height, building** in its entirety and substituting the following:

<b>“Height, building</b>	means the vertical distance between <b>finished site grade</b> and: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) for <b>single detached housing</b> with 2 and half (½) <b>storeys</b> having a roof pitch greater than 4-to-12 and not exceeding a roof pitch of 12-to-12, the mid-point between the bottom of the <b>eave</b> line and ridge of a roof, provided that the ridge of the roof is not more than 1.5 m above the mid-point; and</li><li>b) for all other <b>buildings</b>, the highest point of the <b>building</b>, whether such <b>building</b> has a flat roof, pitched roof or more than one type of roof.”</li></ol>
--------------------------	---

- (c) deleting the definition of **Residential vertical lot width envelope** and substituting the following:

<b>“Residential vertical lot width envelope</b>	means the vertical envelope within which a <b>single detached housing</b> or <b>two-unit housing</b> must be contained, as calculated in accordance with Section 4.18”
---	--

2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 4.3 [Calculation of Density in Single Detached Housing and Two-Unit Housing Zones] by:

- (a) deleting Section 4.3.1(c) in its entirety and marking it as “Repealed.”; and

- (b) adding the following after Section 4.3.1:

“4.3.2 Any portion of **floor area** in a **principal building** with a **ceiling height** which exceeds 3.7 m shall be considered to comprise two floors and shall be measured as such for the purposes of calculating **density** in all **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing**, except that, subject to Section 4.3.3, the following **floor area** shall be considered to comprise one floor:


- a) a maximum of 10 m<sup>2</sup> of **floor area** with a **ceiling height** which exceeds 3.7 m, provided such **floor area** is exclusively for interior entry and staircase purposes; and
- b) an additional maximum of 15 m<sup>2</sup> of **floor area** with a **ceiling height** between 3.7 m and 5 m, provided the **floor area** is located at least 2.0 m from the **interior side yard** and **rear yard**.

4.3.3 If the **floor area** to be calculated in accordance with the exception in subsection 4.3.2(a) or (b) is located on the **first storey**, the exterior wall of the **first storey** which faces the **interior side yard** and **rear yard**, as measured from finished floor to the bottom of the eave, must be no higher than 3.7 m.”

3. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by adding the following after Section 4.17:

“4.18.1 The **residential vertical lot width envelope** of a **lot** in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** or **two-unit housing** shall be calculated in accordance with Sections 4.18.2 to 4.18.4.


4.18.2 For a **lot** with a **lot width** that is 10.0 m or less, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of 45° from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




(A) When lot width is 10.0 m or less

4.18.3 For a lot with a lot width that is greater than 10.0 m but less than 18.0 m:

- a) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of  $45^\circ$  from the top of the vertical 5.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




- b) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two and half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 6.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward and upward at an angle of  $30^\circ$  from the top of the 6.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:




4.18.4 For a lot with a lot width that is 18.0 m or greater:

- a) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward (horizontally) by 0.6 m and upward (vertically) by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an angle of 30° from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 9.0 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



- b) for **single detached housing** and **two-unit housing** with two and half (½) **storeys**, the **residential vertical lot width envelope** shall be a vertical envelope located parallel to and 1.2 m from each **side lot line**, and formed by planes rising vertically 5.0 m, as calculated from the **finished site grade**, and then extending inward by 0.6 m and upward by 1.0 m, and then further inward and upward at an

angle of  $30^{\circ}$  from the top of the 1.0 m to the point at which the planes intersect with the maximum height plane of 10.5 m, as generally shown in the diagram below:



4. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.7.7 and 4.7.8 and substituting the following:

“4.7.7 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and
- the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

4.7.8 Repealed”

5. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4 and substituting the following:

“4.8.3 Unless otherwise specified in a **zone**, detached **accessory buildings** up to 70.0 m<sup>2</sup> may be located within the **rear yard**, provided:

- the area of all detached **accessory buildings** located entirely or partially in the **rear yard** cover no more than 40% of the **rear yard**;
- the **setback** from the **front lot line** is greater than 20.0 m; and

- c) the **setback** from the exterior **side lot line** is greater than 7.5 m.

4.8.4 Repealed”

6. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsection 4.14.4 and substituting the following:

“4.14.4 Except as set-out in 4.14.4(a) to (c) below or otherwise specified in a **zone**, the **accessory building** or **accessory structures** shall not be higher than the permitted **height** of the **principal building** in that **zone**. The following apply to the **height** of **accessory buildings** in **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing** and **town housing**:

- a) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** less than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 3.0 m measured from **finished site grade** to the roof ridge for a detached **accessory building** with a pitched roof, and 2.5 m for a detached **accessory building** with a flat roof;
- b) the maximum **height** for detached **accessory buildings** greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> is 4.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for an **accessory building** with a pitched roof, and 3.0 m for an **accessory building** with a flat roof; and
- c) the maximum **height** for an attached **garage** constructed as part of a **principal building** is 6.0 m measured from **finished grade** to the roof ridge for a **garage** with a pitched roof, and 4.5 m for a **garage** with a flat roof.”

7. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.1 [Single Detached (RS1/A-H, J-K; RS2/A-H, J-K)] by deleting subsection 8.1.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.
8. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.2 [Compact Single Detached (RC1, RC2)] by:
  - a) deleting subsections 8.2.6.5 and marking it “Repealed.”; and
  - b) deleting subsection 8.2.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”.
9. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.3 [Coach Houses (RCH, RCH1)] by:
  - a) deleting Section 8.3.7.6 in its entirety and substituting the following:

“6. The maximum **height** for an **accessory building** containing a **coach house** shall be:

- a) in the RCH **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 7.4 m, whichever is less, measured to the roof ridge; and

- b) in the RCH1 **zone**, 2 **storeys** or 6.0 m above the highest elevation of the crown of the **abutting lane** measured to the roof ridge, whichever is less.”
10. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.4 [Two-Unit Dwellings (RD1, RD2)] by deleting subsection 8.4.7.3 and marking it “Repealed.”.
  11. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.13 [Residential Child Care (RCC)] by deleting subsection 8.13.7.2 and marking it “Repealed.”.
  12. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, as amended, is further amended at Section 8.14 [Single Detached with Granny Flat or Coach House – Edgemere (RE1)] by deleting subsection 8.14.7.6 and marking it “Repealed.”
  13. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9249”**.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

_____	CITY OF RICHMOND
_____	
_____	APPROVED by <i>GW</i>
_____	APPROVED by Director or Solicitor <i>h2</i>
_____	

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE OFFICER