



# City of Richmond

## Report to Committee Planning and Development Division


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




**Date:** June 6, 2017  
**File:** 08-4430-01/2017-Vol 01

**Re:** Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

### Staff Recommendations

1. That Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524, to amend building massing regulations for single family dwellings be introduced and given first reading; and
2. That staff report back to Council within 12 months with a follow-up report on implementation of new massing regulations.

  
Wayne Craig  
Director, Development  
  
BK/JC:blg  
Att. 4

REPORT CONCURRENCE	
CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER	
	
REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE	INITIALS: 
APPROVED BY CAO	
	

## Staff Report

### Origin

At the July 27, 2015 Regular Council meeting, the following referral was passed:

*That staff conduct further research and analysis into (i) maximum depth of house, (ii) rear yard setbacks to house, (iii) rear yard setback for larger detached accessory buildings, (iv) interior side yard setbacks, (v) projections into required side yard setbacks, and (vi) secondary (upper floor) building envelope and report back.*

A staff report seeking authorization for public consultation was endorsed at the November 22, 2016 Planning Committee meeting, and the November 28 Regular Council meeting.

This staff report provides a summary of the results of public consultations held across the city during January and February of 2017, regarding possible amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 for further refinement to single family building massing. The report also brings forward Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524, to introduce recommended zoning amendments for single family building massing.

Since the adoption of the first round of single family building massing amendments September 14, 2015, staff have noted changes to the design of single family residential houses recently constructed, which show a reduction in building massing. Specifically, the amendments to residential vertical lot width envelope, overall building height reduction, the clarification of internal ceiling height for entry and staircase, and the height limits for attached forward-projecting garages and detached accessory buildings have had the most positive impact.

### Public Consultation: Information Meetings, On-line Comment Forms and Social Media

#### Information Meetings

In late 2016, Council endorsed a public consultation package outlining building massing issues and potential bylaw amendments. As directed by Council, staff held six public Open Houses at community centres across the city, and one Open House at City Hall as follows:

Wednesday, January 18	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	South Arm Community Centre
Tuesday, January 24	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	Steveston Community Centre
Thursday, February 2	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	Hamilton Community Centre
Wednesday, February 8	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	City Hall Meeting - Richmond Small Builders
Thursday, February 9	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	City Hall (for general public)
Thursday, February 16	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	Cambie Community Centre
Thursday, February 23	6 p.m. to 8 p.m.	Thompson Community Centre

Total attendance at the Open Houses was 195. Display boards were set up to provide an overview of the potential amendments to address various building massing issues associated with (Attachment 1). Staff from the Development Applications Department and Building Approvals Division were in attendance at all meetings, and were available to answer specific questions.

Printed comment forms were given to all attendees to provide feedback, and the public was encouraged to use the Let's Talk Richmond website to provide their feedback, as well as make suggestions for alternatives to the options presented.

Throughout the consultation process, staff stressed that there were no recommended bylaw amendments in the material presented. The meetings were held – as directed by Council – to present a range of options for addressing on-going concerns raised by the public regarding the design of new single family houses, and the impacts on adjacent homes.

Staff also held a separate meeting with representatives of the local home building community on February 8, 2017 to discuss the range of possible amendments and hear their concerns. The local building community has expressed concerns regarding the some of the potential regulations contained in the public consultation materials, and their potential impact on house design they feel would arise from the regulations and the subsequent marketability of the resulting houses. A copy of their submission is provided in Attachment 4.

### **Comment Form Summary**

The consultation period for providing feedback closed on March 5, 2017; with 796 feedback forms received. A total of 161 hand-written forms were submitted at the Public Open Houses, dropped off at City Hall or delivered by Canada Post, and 635 forms were submitted through the Let's Talk Richmond website.

The comment form provided asked participants to indicate if they supported regulating specific aspects (including setbacks, site coverage, landscaping, entry gates, garage projection) of single family house design (a Yes, No, or No Opinion question). If respondents indicated Yes – that they did support an amendment – they were asked to choose from a range of options.

Based on the comment sheets received, there is a moderate level of support for amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to regulate single family house massing as presented at the Open Houses. Whenever possible during the public consultation, staff stressed that a status quo option was available for those who wished to see no changes to the single family massing regulations in the Zoning Bylaw. A summary of all comment sheets submitted is provided in Attachment 2. Additional public correspondence received is provided in Attachment 3. A binder of all comment forms and additional correspondence received has been placed in the Councillor's office for review, with a copy at the Front of House for the public.

The Open Houses proved to be a useful opportunity for residents to provide their input. The local building community raised concerns with the proposed changes, and suggested that other measures such as on-site landscaping, screening and fencing might be as effective in mitigating building massing issues, rather than additional amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

### **Social Media Summary**

Staff in Corporate Communications assisted the Planning and Development Division to manage the social media presence for the massing consultation. Using Facebook and Twitter, staff were

able to inform over 12,000 people of the public consultation, provide links to reports, and direct interested residents to the Let's Talk Richmond website.

### Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524 has been drafted to introduce a number of recommended changes to single family massing regulations. A summary table of the massing issues and proposed amendments is provided below, with detailed discussion of each in the sections that follow the table.

Massing Issue	Proposed Amendment
Side Yard Massing on Adjacent Lots	Maximum Depth of House / definition of continuous wall
Setbacks	Rear yard setbacks Accessory building side and rear yard setbacks Permitted projections into required side yards
Landscaping	Minimum front yard landscaping Tree planting requirements for Building Permits Site Coverage and Landscaping Calculation / definition of hard surfaces
Front Entry Gates	Minimum Setback on arterial roads
Garage Projection	Maximum forward projection of attached garage
Building Height	New definition of finished grade

Each proposed amendment outlined below provides a summary of comments received through the public consultation and a recommended amendment to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

#### Maximum Depth of House

During the consultation on single family house massing, the impact of new house construction on adjacent, pre-existing houses has been raised. A concern often made is the impact of the length of sidewall on a house built with minimum front and rear setbacks – which staff have described as the depth of the house.

Staff presented three options regarding new zoning regulations to limit the maximum permitted depth of single family house on a lot:

1. *Option 1* - Status quo – leave current practices unchanged – continue to require only the existing minimum 6.0 m front yard and 6 m rear yard setback;
2. *Option 2* – Limit the maximum depth of house for new single-family house construction to a maximum continuous wall of 55% of the total lot depth; or
3. *Option 3* – Limit the maximum depth of house for new single-family house construction to a maximum continuous wall of 50% of the total lot depth.

These options are illustrated on Page 2 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public comment on support for a new regulation on maximum house depth was:

- **Yes** 57.4%
- **No** 41.9%
- **No Opinion** 0.4%

Of those who stated support an amendment to regulate house depth:

- 89.2 % of respondents were in favour of limiting the maximum house depth to a maximum continuous wall to 50% of the total lot depth
- 10.8 % of respondents were in favour of a maximum house depth of 55%

Staff also received input from the local house building community that they preferred the status quo – no change to the depth of the house, as they felt that the negative impacts to house design and yard space would not be supportable.

Based on the comments received, and in light of the other recommended amendments outlined in this report, staff recommend that Part B, Sections 8.1 8.14 Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended as follows:

No **single detached housing dwelling unit** shall have an exterior wall oriented to an **interior side yard** with a maximum length of **continuous wall** greater than 55% of the **total lot depth**.

In order to implement this new regulation, an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to create a new definition of a **continuous wall** is required:

**Continuous wall** means an exterior wall on a **single detached housing dwelling unit**, which does not include an inward articulation of 2.4 m or more, with a minimum horizontal measurement of 2.4 m.

This proposed definition will clearly establish the maximum length of wall permitted and the proposed 2.4 m (8 ft) inward articulation of the wall ensure that variation is provided on walls oriented to side setbacks between houses, and will work to address the concerns raised about the impact of new construction on pre-existing single family houses in established neighbourhoods.

### Rear Yard Setbacks

As the trend in recent years as has been to build new single family houses to minimum setbacks, staff have received a number of concerns about the negative impacts of new construction on adjacent back yards. Many pre-existing single family dwellings in established neighbourhoods have rear yards deeper than the minimum, and older house styles tended to have lower rear yard massing than seen in current trends in single family dwelling construction.

Staff asked the public to provide their feedback on three potential changes to Zoning Bylaw regulations for minimum rear yard setbacks in single family zones. These options were:

1. *Option 1* - Status quo – continue to implement a minimum rear yard setback of 6.0 m;
2. *Option 2* – Establish a new requirement for:
  - Minimum rear yard setback of 6.0 m for the ground floor – limited to a maximum of 60% of the width of the house.
  - Remaining 40% of wall face for the ground floor at a minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 m.
  - Minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 m for any second storey or half-storey.
  - Lots less than 28 m deep and less than 372 m<sup>2</sup> in area would be exempt from this setback requirement and would be permitted to utilize a 6 m rear yard setback; or
3. *Option 3* – Establish a new requirement that the minimum rear yard setback is the greater of 6.0 m or 25% of the lot depth, up to a maximum of 10.7 m. Lots less than 28 m deep would be exempt from this setback requirement and would be permitted to utilize a 6.0 m rear yard setback.

These options are illustrated on Pages 3 through 6 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public response on some form of amended rear yard setbacks was:

- **Yes** 55.5%
- **No** 43.7%
- **No Opinion** 0.9%

Of those in favour of an amendment to required rear yard setbacks:

- 79.2 % of respondents were in favour of Option 3 - a minimum setback of 25% of the lot depth, up to a maximum of 10.7 m
- 20.8% of those in favour of an amendment supported a varied setback of 6 m for the ground floor – limited to a maximum of 60% of the width of the house, remaining 40% of wall face at a minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 m and a minimum rear yard setback of 7.5 m for any second storey or half-storey.

The local building community voiced concerns that any increase to the minimum rear yard setbacks would have negative implications on buildable floor area on a lot; reducing the development potential. Staff have reviewed all the potential amendments presented to Council and to the public and adoption of any of the measures would not reduce buildable density on the property.

Staff recommend that the Single Detached Zone (RS1/A to RS1/K Zones) in Section 8.1 of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, be amended to reflect Option 3 (above) as follows:

8.1.6.6 The minimum **rear yard** is:

- (a) For a **lot** with a **lot area** less than 372 m<sup>2</sup> and with a **lot depth** less than 28 m, the minimum **rear yard** is 6.0 m;

- (b) For a **lot** with a **lot area** greater than 372 m<sup>2</sup> and with a **lot depth** greater than 28 m, the minimum **rear yard** is the greater of 6.0 m or 25% of the total **lot depth**, up to a maximum of 10.7 m.
- (c) For a **lot** containing a **dwelling, single detached** of one storey only, the **rear yard** is 6.0 m.

As was presented to Council in November, 2016, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524, has been drafted to address smaller and shallow lots, which would be exempt from these provisions, as the buildable area would be reduced by these proposed changes.

#### Rear and Side Yard Setbacks for Larger Detached Accessory Buildings

During the 2015 public consultation on the first round of single family building massing, there were concerns raised by the public regarding the minimum setback for larger detached accessory structures in rear yards. The Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 amendments adopted September 14, 2015 for building massing reduced the maximum permitted height for detached accessory buildings, and established a new maximum size of 70 m<sup>2</sup>.

Staff consulted with the public to provide their feedback on an amendment to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase minimum required side yard and rear yard setbacks for detached accessory buildings up to a maximum of 70 m<sup>2</sup>. Two options were presented:

1. *Option 1* - Status quo – no change to current minimum rear yard setback of 1.2 m for an accessory building more than 10 m<sup>2</sup> in area (up to a maximum of 70 m<sup>2</sup>); or
2. *Option 2* – Implement a variable minimum rear yard setback for a detached accessory structure larger than 10 m<sup>2</sup> (up to a maximum of 70 m<sup>2</sup>) as follows:
  - The minimum rear yard and side yard setbacks are 1.2 m if the exposed face of the accessory building oriented to the rear lot line is 6 m wide or less, or
  - The minimum rear yard and side yard setbacks are 2.4 m if the exposed face of the accessory building oriented to the rear lot line is greater than 6 m.
  - If the accessory structure is located adjacent to a rear lane a rear yard setback of 1.2 m is required.

The proposed amendment is illustrated on Page 8 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public response to this question was:

- **Yes** 52.1%
- **No** 43.1%
- **No Opinion** 4.7%

Based on the feedback received, staff recommend that Section 4.7.7(f) of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended as follows:

- f) i) for detached **accessory buildings** with a maximum wall length of 6 m or less, and oriented to the **lot line, rear** or **lot line, side** not **abutting** a public road the

minimum **setback** from the **lot line, rear and side lot line, side not abutting** a public **road** is 1.2 m.

ii) for detached **accessory buildings** with a maximum wall length greater than 6 m, and oriented to the **lot line, rear or lot line, side not abutting** a public road the minimum **setback** from the **lot line, rear and side lot line, side not abutting** a public **road** is 2.4 m.

Amending Section 4.7.7 (f) of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 will make this new regulation applicable in all zones that permit detached accessory buildings, and should address concerns arising from rear and side yard interface in these zones.

#### Interior Side Yard Setbacks and Permitted Projections

The use of side yard projections on new single family house construction has been raised as a concern a number of times through public feedback on single family residential development, with specific concerns related to the impact these projections have on adjacent side yards. Staff consulted through the Open Houses on the issue of zoning regulations for permitted projections into minimum required side yards, and presented three options:

1. *Option 1 – Status quo* – no change to current minimum permitted projections into side yard setbacks which allow 0.6 m (2 ft.) projections into the side yard setback of 1.2 m, with no limit on the width of the projection;
2. *Option 2* – Allow one 0.6 m projection into the required side yard setback, limited to 1.8 m in length, and limited to one exterior wall only; or
3. *Option 3* – Eliminate the bylaw provision which allows projections into side yards.

These options are illustrated on Page 9 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

When asked if there was support for amending zoning regulations for projections into side yards the public response was:

- **Yes** 53.4%
- **No** 43.4%
- **No Opinion** 3.2%

Of those in favour of amending Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 for permitted side yard projections:

- 79.1% of respondents were in favour of eliminating all side yard projections,
- 20.9% were in favour of allowing a 0.6 m projection into the required side yard setback, limited to 1.8 m in length, and limited to one exterior wall only.
- The local house builders were in favour of Option 2 – one projection on one wall, limited to 1.8 m wide.

Respecting the feedback received, staff have proposed a variation to the projection regulations presented to the public – to limit the permitted side yard projection to one only, on one side of a house, and further limited to fireplace/chimney assembly only – eliminating the use of bay



windows and hatches on side yards. Staff are of the opinion that this will significantly reduce the impacts of the projections on adjacent side yards.

Staff recommend three amendments to Part 4, General Regulations, Section 4.7 of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

A new clause will be inserted into this Section 4.7:

4.7.1 Notwithstanding a provision for a projection into a **side yard**, the maximum number of projections is one, limited to one side wall of **dwelling unit, single detached**, for the purposes of a chimney or fireplace assembly only, and shall not exceed 1.8 m in horizontal length. No masonry footing is permitted for the chimney or fireplace assembly.

Additional minor housekeeping changes will be required in Section 4.7 to implement this change.

#### Definition of Non-Porous Surfaces

In order to provide more clarity to the bylaw, staff proposes the following amendment to the definition of 'non-porous surface' in Part A, Section 3, Definitions:

**Non-porous surfaces** means any constructed surface on, above or below ground that does not allow precipitation or surface water to penetrate directly into the underlying soil. Surfacing materials considered as non-porous are concrete, asphalt, and grouted brick or stone.

The proposed change to the definition of 'non-porous' surface will clarify the range of materials which can be used to achieve minimum permeability standards for new single family residential development, and will assist staff in working with the developer to address on-site drainage and site design concerns.

#### Front Yard Landscaping

Section 8.1 of Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 – Single Detached Zones – currently specifies a minimum percentage of the lot (depending on the zone) that must be landscaped but does not stipulate where the minimum landscaping requirements must be provided on the lot. The result is that new house construction sometimes features the majority of the front yard covered with pavement or other hard surfacing.

Open House participants were asked to consider three options for potential amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to increase front yard landscaping:

1. *Option 1* – **Status quo** – no change to existing requirements for live landscaping – minimum of 25% of the lot, with no location specified.
2. *Option 2* – Require that a minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be covered in live landscaping.

3. *Option 3* – Require that a minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be covered in live landscaping.

These options are illustrated on Page 15 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public comment on amending zoning regulations to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping was:

- **Yes** 58.2%
- **No** 40.1%
- **No Opinion** 1.7%

Of those who stated they supported an amendment:

- 76.2% of respondents were in favour of an amendment to require a minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback to be planted with live landscaping
- 23.8% of respondents were in favour of requiring a minimum of 50% of the front yard to be planted with live landscaping.
- The Richmond Home Builders Group supported Option 2 – 50% of the front yard landscaped.

Based on the consultation results, and staff analysis of potential implications, it is recommended the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended in Section 6.4 to amend Section 6.4.1 as follows:

6.4.1. In the **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that govern **single detached housing**, the **owner** of the property is responsible for the placement and proper maintenance of **landscaping**, in the **front yard** as follows:

- a) for a **lot** with a **lot width** less than or equal to 15 m, live **landscaping** is to be provided covering a minimum of 50% of the required **front yard**.
- b) for a **lot** with a **lot width** greater than 15 m, live **landscaping** is to be provided covering a minimum of 55% of the required **front yard**.
- c) for an irregular-shaped **lot**, the **City** shall determine the minimum area required for live **landscaping**, having regard to the area required for a paved driveway or walkway, to provide access to garage or house, and shall be located so as to maximize its functionality by ensuring its proper location in relation to **buildings**, sunlight, parking and other **site** factors.

Staff have proposed this amendment based on feedback from the building community and more detailed analysis of the ability to construct a standard driveway on lots of varying width. The requirement for the minimum landscaping as proposed will enhance the streetscape by ensuring that less of the required front yard is covered by pavement. We note that the percentage of the front yard of an irregular-shaped lot which can be landscaped will be less than the proposed minimum due to lot configuration. Staff will ensure that as much of the front yard is landscaped as possible.

### Tree Planting Requirements

Retention and replacement of trees impacted through single family redevelopment continues to be a concern of residents.

The consultation results on amending tree planting requirements in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to require two trees on a lot for a Building Permit for a lot where there are no pre-existing trees, the results were:

- **Yes** 64.6%
- **No** 33.5%
- **No Opinion** 1.9%

This proposal is illustrated on Page 14 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

Staff recommend that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended to bylaw to insert a new clause in Part 6 – Landscaping and Screening as follows:

6.4.1 (c) On a **lot** that is subject to a Building Permit application for **single detached housing** which contains no existing trees at the time of Building Permit application, a minimum of two trees – one in the required **front yard setback** and one in the required **rear yard setback** – must be planted as part of a Building Permit.

Staff will also continue to secure tree replacements and enhancement through the rezoning process. Please see Page 15 of Attachment 1 for a diagram of these options.

### Maximum Permitted Site Coverage

A concern often cited by residents regarding new single family house construction is the trend to utilizing the maximum site coverage permitted for building and hard surfaces, and to provide minimal landscaping in front yards. The public consultation posed a question of whether there was support to amend Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to change requirements for site coverage, and presented three options for consideration:

1. *Option 1* – Status quo – no change to current maximum permitted lot coverage: 45% of the lot area for buildings, and total lot coverage of 70%, and live landscaping as follows:
  - a) 20% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
  - b) 25% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
  - c) 30% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H.
2. *Option 2* – The maximum permitted lot coverage be reduced to 42% for buildings, and total lot coverage be reduced to 65% for buildings, structures and non-porous surfaces and live landscaping be increased as follows:
  - a) 25% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
  - b) 30% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
  - c) 35% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H.
  - d) Any area between the side lot line and building face is excluded from the calculation of minimum landscaped area.

3. *Option 3* – The maximum permitted site coverage be reduced to 40% for buildings, and total lot coverage be reduced to 60% for buildings, structures and non-porous surfaces and live landscaping be increased as follows:
- 30% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
  - 35% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
  - 40% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H.
  - Any area between the side lot line and building face is excluded from the calculation of minimum landscaped area.

These options are illustrated on Pages 12 and 13 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

In response to the question regarding changes to regulations for site coverage, the public comment was:

- **Yes** 55.8%
- **No** 42.5%
- **No Opinion** 1.8%

Of those who stated they supported an amendment:

- 75.8% of respondents were in favour of Option 3 - reducing the maximum building site coverage to 40%, reducing maximum overall site coverage to 60% and requiring a minimum of 30% to 40% of the site to be covered by live landscaping (depending on the residential zone), and that the side yard area between the house and the property line not be included in calculations of landscaping requirements.
- The local house builders favoured retaining the status quo – as they are concerned that any reduction in site coverage – specifically a reduction in hard surface areas – would result in less viable outdoor amenity areas.

Staff have reviewed the range of feedback provided, and are of the opinion that the combination of regulations proposed for front yard landscaping, rear yard setbacks and tree planting will address many of the issues raised in the public consultation on these issues, and any additional reduction to site coverage for building or hard surfaces is not required.

Based on the consultation results, and staff analysis of potential implications, it is recommended that a minor amendment to Zoning Bylaw 8500 be considered:

Existing Section 8.1.5 be amended to add a new section as follows: in its entirety, and replaced with:

- Any **side yard setback** area is excluded from the calculation of percentages of the **lot area which** is restricted to **landscaping** with live plant material.

#### Front Entry Gates

Recent house construction trends have seen increased use of masonry fences in front yards, and mechanical gates. Staff have identified potential traffic and safety concerns arising from the

construction of gates: as cars must stop in street and wait for the gate to open, causing potential traffic issues for other vehicles using the street. Staff note that it is unlawful for the City to prohibit front yard fences or gates, but as per the *Local Government Act*, Council is able to regulate these structures, including siting, height and setbacks. Currently, Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 regulates the maximum height of a fence located in the front yard to 1.2 m.

Staff asked the public to provide their feedback on the issue of front entry gates for single family residential lots.

The proposed amendment is illustrated on Page 16 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public comment on potentially regulating front entry gates was:

- Yes 55.8%
- No 41.5%
- No Opinion 2.7%

In addition to the comment sheets results, staff also fielded a considerable number of questions regarding the proposed regulation of entry gates, and it was suggested that traffic safety issues were less likely to occur on local roads, as opposed to major or minor arterial roads.

Staff have considered these comments, and are of the opinion that there is merit to this suggestion, and propose the following amendment to the regulations on fencing in Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500:

1. For a **lot** fronting onto a local **arterial road** or a major **arterial road**, a solid masonry or brick **fence** up to a maximum **fence height** of 1.2 m is permitted within the required **front yard setback** area, but any mechanical or manual gate must be located no closer than 6.0 m from the front **property line**.

#### Garage Projection

Staff asked the public to provide their feedback on a general question of support for amending zoning for garage projection for single family residential lots. Staff presented four options for public consideration at the Open House:

1. *Option 1* – Status quo – no change to existing zoning as it pertains to garage placement and design.
2. *Option 2* – Require that a garage can project a maximum of 9.1 m from the front façade of the house.
3. *Option 3* – Require that a garage can project a maximum of 7.3 m from the front façade of the house.
4. *Option 4* – Require that a garage can project a maximum of 6.6 m from the front façade of the house.

These options are illustrated on Page 17 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public comment on an amendment to regulate front garage projection was:

- **Yes** 54.5%
- **No** 43.0%
- **No Opinion** 2.6%

Of those who stated they supported an amendment to regulate maximum garage projection for single family dwellings:

- 74.7 % of respondents were in favour of limiting the maximum garage projection to 6.6 m
- 17.1% of respondents favoured a limit of 7.3
- 8.2% of responses indicated support for a maximum projection of 9.1 m
- The local house builders also raised concerns as the option for an attached three-car garage is a strong marketing feature for new house construction in Richmond, and the builders requested no changes be made to the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 with regards to this issue.

Based on the comments received, and the suite of other changes proposed in this report, staff recommend that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended to limit the maximum forward projection for an attached garage for a single family house to a maximum of 9.1 m. The combination of proposed house depth limit, minimum landscaping requirements for front yards, and new regulation for side yard projections will enhance the streetscape in single family residential areas, and will reduce the impact of a forward-projecting three-car garage. Staff also note that the single family dwelling massing regulations adopted September 14, 2015 to set a maximum height of a forward-projecting garage to 6.0 m has had positive impacts on recent single family house designs.

#### Datum for Measurement of Building Height

Staff asked the public to provide their feedback on a potential amendment for the method by which finished grade is measured.

The proposal is illustrated on Page 18 of the Public Consultation Materials in Attachment 1.

The public comment on the grade measurement amendment was:

- **Yes** 60.1%
- **No** 38.5%
- **No Opinion** 1.4%

Based on the feedback received, staff recommend that Zoning Bylaw 8500 be amended to define the definition of **grade, finished site** as:

means in Area 'A', the average ground elevation identified on a **lot** grading plan approved by the **City**, not exceeding 0.3 m above the highest elevation of the crown of any public **road abutting** the **lot**.

Staff is of the opinion that utilizing this simpler method of calculating building height from the datum at 0.3 m above the crown of the road, will further reduce the height and massing of single family houses.

### Decks for Single Family Houses

Through previous public consultation, concerns were heard regarding the loss of privacy in rear yards of existing houses when new houses are constructed, due to potential overlook onto adjacent rear yards. Staff consulted through the Open Houses on the location of second storey decks on single family dwellings, and presented two options for consideration:

1. Status quo – maintain the current requirements for decks as regulated by building setbacks and permitted projections; or
2. Amend the regulations for rear decks as follows:
  - A second storey deck can span no more than 50% of the maximum width of the rear wall of the house;
  - A second storey deck must have an additional setback of 1.5 m from the minimum interior side yard setback; and
  - A second storey deck must have an additional setback of 1.5 from the minimum rear yard setback.

The public comment on the question regarding changing Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to regulate the location of second storey decks was:

- Yes 52.6%
- No 43.9%
- No Opinion 3.6%

Based on the response received, and the suite of changes proposed, including amendments to rear yards, staff recommend that no changes be made to the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 to regulate decks.

### **Other Existing Zones**

We note that if adopted by Council, the proposed changes will not be applied to any of the existing site-specific single family residential zones, the compact single family or the coach house/granny flat zones. These regulations would also not be applicable to residential development permitted under the AG Agriculture zones.

Should Council wish staff to amend single family building massing in all zones that permit single family residential uses, it would be in order for Council to endorse a third recommendation to this report:

*That staff report back to Council with bylaw amendments for single family building massing in all zones that permit single family residential development.*

### Consideration of Variances

As per the *Local Government Act*, other than use and density, any aspect of the Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 can be varied through a Development Variance Permit. If there is site-specific case for an alternative design a property owner can apply for a variance. Should site conditions or a unique design warrant a variance, the review process includes opportunity for public input. Issuance of the variance permit must be approved by Council.

### Public Consultation on Proposed Bylaw Amendments

Should the Planning Committee endorse the proposed amendments, and Council grant first reading to the proposed amendments, the bylaw will be forwarded to a Public Hearing; where any area resident or interested party will have an opportunity to comment. Public notification for the Public Hearing will be provided as per the *Local Government Act*.

### Conclusion

As directed by Council, staff have continued to review Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 as the bylaw pertains to the massing and design of single family dwellings. Public consultation through Open Houses was conducted in six separate locations across the city and staff consulted with the local building community, to gauge opinion and obtain feedback on a number of options to further amend zoning for single family house design.

Direct feedback received through comment forms provided and submission provided through the Let's Talk Richmond website is summarized in this report. As detailed in the feedback summary, and throughout this report, there was general support for further refinements to the single family residential zoning to regulate house massing and design.


It is recommended that Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524, be introduced and given first reading.



Barry Konkin  
Program Coordinator, Development



Gavin Woo  
Senior Manager, Building Approvals



James Cooper  
Manager, Plan Approvals

BK/JC:blg

- Attachment 1: Public Consultation Materials
- Attachment 2: Public Consultation Summary
- Attachment 3: Other Public Correspondence Received
- Attachment 4: Submission from the Richmond Home Builders Group



Proposed Amendments to Single Family Zoning in Bylaw 8500

Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase



2017-01-09




## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

### Analysis:

Current trends in single family home construction have raised a number of issues in established neighborhoods. These include:

1. Construction of larger, 2-storey homes that tend to occupy more of the lot and also tend to have higher overall building heights when compared to older, nearby houses.
2. New homes typically feature higher interior ceiling height which can result in higher second storey windows that may overlook neighboring rear yards and side windows on existing houses.
3. Side entry front garages can result in the house being located toward the rear of the lot with only the minimum rear yard provided.
4. High ceilings in family and living rooms that face the rear yard may result in rear walls that are higher, more expansive, and are generally more massive than older, pre-existing houses.
5. Entry gates and large paved areas are often built to accommodate the front projecting garage, and auto manoeuvring space.
6. Minimal front yard landscaping and tree planting are provided.



Proposed Amendments to Single Family Zoning in Bylaw 8500  
**Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase**

**MAXIMUM DEPTH OF HOUSE**

*An amendment to limit the maximum physical depth of a house while still maintaining the allowable house size under the Zoning Bylaw could help make new houses more compatible in existing neighbourhoods.*

**OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):**

No limitations to overall depth of house — Minimum front and rear setbacks


**OPTION 2:**

Continuous length of wall limited to 55% of total lot depth

**OPTION 3:**

Continuous length of wall limited to 50% of total lot depth

A continuous wall is defined as a wall without a minimum inward articulation of 2.4 m (8 ft) or more from the minimum required side yard setback.



## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

### REAR YARD SETBACKS

*An amendment to require larger setbacks on a portion of the rear of the house, and for any second storey, would increase rear yard open space.*

#### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

Continue to require 6.0 m (20 ft) minimum rear yard setback.


#### OPTION 2:

No more than 60% of the rear wall of the first storey can be set back 6 m (20 ft) from the rear property line, and the rest of the first storey 40% must be set back at least 7.5 m (25 ft) from the rear property line.

If the house has a second or half storey above, all of that portion of the rear wall must be set back at least 7.5 m (25 ft) from the rear property line.

A one-storey house would have a 6.0 m (20 ft) rear yard setback.

**NOTE:** If a lot is less than 28 m (92 ft) deep and less than 372 m<sup>2</sup> (4,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area the minimum rear yard setback can be 6.0 m (20 ft).



## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

### EXAMPLES OF MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK BASED ON WITH LOT DEPTH

#### MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK BASED ON LOT DEPTH

##### OPTION 3:


The minimum rear yard setback would be the greater of 6.0 m (20 ft), or 25% of the total lot depth, up to a maximum required setback of 10.7 m (35 ft).

**NOTE:** If a lot is less than 28 m (92 ft) deep and less than 372 m<sup>2</sup> (4,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area the minimum rear yard setback can be 6.0 m (20 ft).



Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

OPTION 2:




MASSING DIAGRAM



SITE SECTION DIAGRAMS

# Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

## OPTION 3: Illustrations




## EXAMPLES:



Proposed Amendments to Single Family Zoning in Bylaw 8500

Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

This graph illustrates how the rear yard setback would increase as the depth of lot increases.





Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

REAR YARD AND SIDE YARD SETBACKS FOR DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDINGS GREATER THAN 10m<sup>2</sup>

OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO): Minimum rear yard and minimum side yard

OPTION 2:


The rear yard and side yard setback for a detached accessory building would vary based on how wide the building is facing the adjacent property:

- If the building face is 6 m (20 ft) or less, the minimum setback for side and rear yard can be 1.2 m (4 ft).
- If the building face is more than 6 m (20 ft), the minimum setback for side and rear yard must be 2.4 m (8 ft).

PLN - 175

EXAMPLE #1: When the wall face (orange line) is 6.0 (20 ft) or less, the rear and side yard setback is 1.2 m (4 ft).

When the wall face (purple line) is more than 6.0 m (20 ft), the rear setback is 2.4 m (8 ft).



EXAMPLE #1:  
Building face to rear property line

EXAMPLE #2:  
Building face to side property line

## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

### PROJECTIONS ALLOWED IN MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS

*An amendment to allowed projections into side yards can increase the light and air between buildings, and reduce the appearance of massing.*

#### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):



Continue to allow a portion of a wall to project a maximum of 0.6 m (2 ft) projection into side yard setbacks on both sides of the house.

#### OPTION 2:

Allow a wall projection into side yard setbacks, for a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft) in length and 0.6 m (2 ft) in depth on one side of the house only.

#### OPTION 3:

No projections permitted into required side yard setbacks.




OPTION 2

OPTION 3


# Proposed Amendments to Single Family Zoning in Bylaw 8500

## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase


### BUILDING MASSING IMPROVEMENTS SINCE THE ADOPTION OF VERTICAL LOT WIDTH ENVELOPE CHANGES IN 2015




EXAMPLE 1



EXAMPLE 2



EXAMPLE 1



EXAMPLE 2

House designs permitted under previous building envelope regulations prior to September 2015

House designs complying to vertical building envelope regulations introduced with zoning amendments September 2015

**Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase**

**LOCATION OF SECOND STOREY DECKS FACING REAR & SIDE YARDS**

*An amendment to regulate the location and size of rear-facing second storey decks can reduce the potential privacy overlook concerns for adjacent properties.*

**OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):**



No restrictions on location and size of 2<sup>nd</sup> storey decks

**OPTION 2:**

A second storey deck located on the rear of a single family dwelling must be set back an additional 1.5 m (5 ft) from the required rear yard setback, and

An additional 1.5 m (5 ft) setback from side yard setback is also required.

The deck cannot be wider than 50% of the wall it is built against.



OPTION #1

OPTION #2

## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### SITE COVERAGE AND LANDSCAPING


*Site coverage is a measurement of the amount of the lot that is covered by buildings or hard surfaces. An amendment to reduce the maximum coverage allowed, while still maintaining the allowable house size under the Zoning Bylaw could provide more greenery in the City.*

#### OPTION 1, STATUS QUO:

This option maintains the current requirements of the Zoning Bylaw - which allows 45% of the lot to be covered by buildings; plus 25% by hard surfaces (driveways, walkways etc.) for a total site coverage of 70%.

The Zoning Bylaw current sets out a minimum area for live landscaping, which varies, depending on the zoning of the property:

- a) 20% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
- b) 25% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
- c) 30% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H



OPTION #1

## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### SITE COVERAGE AND LANDSCAPING (continued)



**OPTION 2:** This option reduces the maximum area that can be covered by buildings to 42% for buildings; and reduces the amount of hard surface coverage to 23%, for total site coverage of 65%. Minimum area for live landscaping would be increased as follows:

- a) 25% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
- b) 30% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
- c) 35% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H
- d) any area between the side lot line and building face is excluded from the calculation of minimum landscaped area

**OPTION 3:** This option reduces the maximum area that can be covered by buildings to 40% for buildings, and reduces the amount of hard surface coverage to 20%, with a total site coverage of 60%. Minimum area for live landscaping would be increased as follows:

- a) 30% on lots zoned RS1/A or K, RS2/A or K;
- b) 35% on lots zoned RS1/B, C or J, RS2/B, C or J; and
- c) 40% on lots zoned RS1/D, E, F, G or H, RS2/D, E, F, G or H
- d) any area between the side lot line and building face is excluded from the calculation of minimum landscaped area

**NOTE:** Building lots smaller than 375 m<sup>2</sup> exempt from reductions in building site coverage which will remain at 45%.



**Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**TREE PLANTING FOR NEW SINGLE FAMILY BUILDING PERMITS WITH LESS THAN TWO EXISTING TREES**


**OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):**

No requirements for new tree planting.

**OPTION 2:**

One new tree to be planted in the front yard and one new tree in the rear yard.

**EXCEPTION:** There is no requirement for new trees if there are at least two trees on the lot, and there are trees in both the front and rear yards.



## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION


### MINIMUM FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS

*Requiring a minimum portion of the front yard setback to be landscaped will bring more greenery to the City.*

#### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

No change - No minimum requirements for live landscaping in the front yard. So long as minimum setbacks are met, live landscaping can be provided anywhere on the lot.

PLN - 182




#### OPTION 3

A minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback must be landscaped with live plantings.

#### OPTION 3:

A minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback must be landscaped with live plantings.





## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### ENTRY GATES


*There are currently no regulations on the placement of mechanical entry gates for single family dwellings in Richmond. An amendment to regulate a minimum setback from the front property line will improve vehicle safety.*

#### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

No restrictions on the location of entry gates.

#### OPTION 2:

A front entry gate is allowed, but can be no higher than 1.2 m (4 ft), and must be setback at least 6 m (20 ft) from the front property line.



## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### GARAGE PROJECTIONS

*An amendment to limit how far a garage can project from the front wall of the house toward the street can reduce the appearance of a large single family dwelling and be more compatible with existing single family character.*

#### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

No restrictions on front garage projections. If required front yard setback is met, there is no limit on garage projection.

#### OPTION 2:


Allow a maximum 9.1 m (30 ft) projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Three-car garage).

#### OPTION 3:

Allow a maximum 7.3 m (24 ft) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).

#### OPTION 4:

Allow a maximum 6.6 m (21.7 ft) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).



**NOTE:** Any garage floor area larger than 50 m<sup>2</sup> (538 ft<sup>2</sup>) is counted towards the overall size of the house.



## Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### MEASURING BUILDING HEIGHT IN AREA “A”

Maximum overall building height is currently measured from a ground elevation to the highest peak, ridge or parapet of the roof. Currently, elevation is the “Average Finish Site Grade” as calculated from the finish elevations at the corners of the lot and the proposed grade around the building.

Staff propose to simplify the process for determining overall building height measurement as follows:

1. In Area A, the base elevation for measuring overall building height be from 0.3 m (1 ft) above the highest crown of road in front of the house.
2. This will establish a common measurement point for the neighbourhood street, ensuring a consistent measurement point.
3. It will also result in easier verification of the maximum height by builders and by staff.





City of  
Richmond

## Single Family Building Massing SURVEY RESULTS

Planning and Development Division  
6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

796 Surveys submitted – combination of on-line and by hand

On-line: 635

By hand: 161

Question results presented as: % of responses (actual # of responses)

### Depth of House

1. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate the maximum depth of house.
  - Yes
  - No (retain status quo – Option 1)
  - No opinion
2. If yes, my preferred option is:
  - Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth -
  - Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth –

#### SURVEY RESULTS:

Yes: 57.7 % (454) No: 41.9 % (330) No opinion: 0.4% (3)

Preferred Option: Option 2 – 10.8% (47) Option 3 – 89.2 % (387)

### Rear Yard Setbacks

3. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.
  - Yes
  - No (retain status quo – Option 1)
  - No opinion
4. If yes, my preferred option is:
  - Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
  - Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% of lot depth)

#### SURVEY RESULTS:

Yes: 55.5 % (437) No: 43.7 % (344)

Preferred Option: Option 2 – 20.8% (89) Option 3 - 79.2% (338)

---

## Rear and Side Yard Setbacks for Accessory Buildings

5. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> (105 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes                       No (retain status quo)                       No opinion

**SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 52.1% (407)   **No:** 43.1% (337)   **No opinion** 4.7 % (37)

---

## Projections into Side Yards

6. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes                       No (retain status quo – Option 1)                       No opinion

7. If yes, my preferred option is:

- Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft.) in length on one side of the house only
- Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections

**SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 53.4% (415)   **No:** 43.4% (37)   **No opinion** 3.2% (25)

**Preferred Option:** Option 2 – 20.9% (83)   Option 3 – 79.1% (314)

---

## Location of Decks for Single Family Houses

8. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings.

Yes                       No (retain status quo)                       No opinion

**SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 52.6% (411)   **No:** 43.9% (343)   **No opinion:** 3.6% (28)

---

## Site Coverage and Minimum Landscaping Requirements

9. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings.

- Yes                       No (retain status quo – Option 1)                       No opinion

10. If yes, my preferred option is:

- Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings  
 Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings

### **SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 55.8% (436) **No:** 42.5% (332) **No opinion:** 1.8% (14)

**Preferred Option:** Option 2 – 24.2% (100) Option 3 - 75.8% (314)

---

## Tree Planting Requirements

11. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot.

- Yes                       No (retain status quo)                       No opinion

### **SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 64.6% (507) **No:** 33.5% (263) **No opinion:** 1.9% (15)

---

## Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements

12. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

- Yes                       No (retain status quo – Option 1)                       No opinion

13. If yes, my preferred option is:

- Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped  
 Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

### **SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 58.2% (457) **No:** 40.1% (315) **No opinion:** 1.7% (13)

**Preferred Option:** Option 2 – 23.8% (104) Option 3 76.2% (333)

---

## Regulation of Entry Gates

14. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.

- Yes                       No     No opinion

### **SURVEY RESULTS:**

**Yes:** 55.8% (440) **No:** 41.5% (327) **No opinion:** 2.7% (21)

**PLN - 188**



I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

- A Richmond resident - 735
- A Richmond builder/developer - 49
- Other -18 (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

My name is (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

My email address is (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper story - 218  | <input type="checkbox"/> Facebook - 56                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News<br>- 131  | <input type="checkbox"/> Twitter - 13                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City of Richmond website: <a href="http://www.richmond.ca">www.richmond.ca</a><br>- 91 | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth - 326                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LetsTalkRichmond.ca website - 197  | <input type="checkbox"/> Saw poster in City facility<br>- 12 |

Thank you for your time and feedback.




# Project Report


16 January 2017 - 07 March 2017

## Lets Talk Richmond


### Proposed single family dwelling building massing regulations



#### Visitors Summary



#### Highlights



Aware Participants	2,182	Engaged	635		
Aware Actions Performed	Participants	Engaged Actions Performed	Registered	Unverified	Anonymous
Visited a Project or Tool Page	2,182	Contributed on Forums	0	0	0
Informed Participants	1,390	Participated in Surveys	635	0	0
Informed Actions	Participants	Contributed to Newsfeeds	0	0	0
Viewed a video	0	Participated in Quick Polls	0	0	0
Viewed a photo	0	Posted on Guestbooks	0	0	0
Downloaded a document	402	Contributed to Stories	0	0	0
Visited the Key Dates page	95	Asked Questions	0	0	0
Visited an FAQ list Page	0	Placed Pins on Maps	0	0	0
Visited Instagram Page	0	Contributed to Brainstormers	0	0	0
Visited Multiple Project Pages	741				
Contributed to a tool	635	<b>PLN - 191</b>			

(engaged)

## ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY

0 FORUM TOPICS    1 SURVEYS    0 NEWS FEEDS    0 QUICK POLLS    0 GUESTBOOKS

0 STORIES    0 Q&A S    0 MAPS    0 BRAINSTORMERS

Tool Type	Engagement Tool Name	Tool	Visitors	Contributors		
				Registered	Unverified	Anonymous
Survey Tool	Building Massing 2017	Archived	1611	635	0	0

## INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY



Widget Type	Engagement Tool Name	Visitors	Views/Downloads
Document	Single Family Building Massing Study Display Boards	378	413
Document	November 28, 2016 Report to Council Single Family Building	101	109
Key Dates	Massing ... Key Date	95	114


## ENGAGEMENT TOOL: SURVEY TOOL

Tool title/name: Building Massing 2017

VISITORS	1611	CONTRIBUTORS	635	CONTRIBUTIONS	796
----------	------	--------------	-----	---------------	-----


**I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

*Optional question*




**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

*Optional question*



**I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**


*Optional question*



**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

*Optional question*


**Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth): 338 (79.2%)**



**Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey: 89 (20.8%)**

**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> (105 ft<sup>2</sup>) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall...**


*Optional question*






**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.**

*Optional question*



**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below)**

*Optional question*




**Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only: 83 (20.9%)**

**Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections: 314 (79.1%)**


**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings.**

*Optional question*




**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits  
and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings.**

*Optional question*




**If yes, my preferred option is:**

*Optional question*




**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot.**

*Optional question*




**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area  
of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.**

*Optional question*



**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below)**


*Optional question*






**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.**

*Optional question*




**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.**

*Optional question*




**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below)**

*Optional question*




**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.**

*Optional question*




**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:  
(check all that apply)**

*Optional question*



**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

*Optional question*



**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: housing controls**From:** [REDACTED]**Sent:** Sunday, 13 November 2016 15:27**To:** Mayor and Councillors**Subject:** housing controls

To all concerned:

Before the November 22 planning committee meeting, I would like to emphasise the importance of the following concerns for any decisions taken to amend the zoning bylaw regarding building massing:

- 1) Green backyards are now virtually nonexistent on lots with mega houses; there should be at least 30 feet of green (not paved) space at the back. Often the house projects so much at the side that you could hardly get a wheelbarrow through there - side projections should be eliminated. The front of the house should be set further back from the street, and that area should include a lot of green.
- 2) Why are houses allowed multiple (as many as four!) garages when we should be trying to reduce the number of cars on the road. Garages should be limited to two per house.
- 3) Mega houses appear fortified with their fences and gates - there is no need for such a feature in Richmond, surely. It is a sign that the residents are not interested in having anything to do with their neighbours. Most of the people living on my street are now Chinese. There are two mega houses, and a third under construction. The people living in the mega houses, which are fenced and gated, are anonymous at best, unfriendly at worst. The Chinese people that have kept the original, 1960's houses on the street, are extraordinarily friendly, even if they don't speak English very well. They will go out of their way to be helpful.
- 4) We need more green space around the houses, and we need to keep the mature trees that are on the properties. In April and July of this year, one of my neighbours cut down two beautiful mature pine trees in his front yard. They were home to dozens of birds and they gave my house protection in summer and winter. This summer the temperature inside my house stayed uncomfortably high, because I had lost all afternoon and evening shade; the sunlight was so intense that I could not keep it out even with blinds and drapes closed. My neighbour has replaced one of the tall pine trees with a tiny cloud or lollipop bush in a planter - it does absolutely nothing, for the environment, atmosphere, or the birds. The other tree has not been replaced and there is no sign that it ever will be.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,  
[REDACTED]**Browse my new website: <http://members.shaw.ca/seiche>**

**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: I LOST MY SUNSHINE

**From:** VICKI [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Monday, 14 November 2016 19:42  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** I LOST MY SUNSHINE

My home is a LUC zoned lot ..40 X 150 with 4 foot width on each side.  
I lost my sunshine as of the Summer of 2015.....See two pictures.  
The amount of light you see on the photo is because it is September.  
Once October arrives I have Sunshine only in the very early morning.  
This house is twice as long as my home...My home is now a teardown.  
This is the result of what I call loose zoning.  
Each lot should be considered individually to protect the existing home  
owners in the neighborhood....

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]





**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: Housing Controls

**From:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Sent:** Friday, 18 November 2016 10:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Housing Controls

Dear [REDACTED]

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence. Copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. Your correspondence has also been forwarded to Mr. Wayne Craig, Director, Development and also Mr. Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals for information.

Please feel free to be in touch with Wayne and/or Gavin at 604-276-4000 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Regards,

Claudia

Claudia Jesson  
Manager, Legislative Services  
City Clerk's Office  
City of Richmond, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1  
Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: [cjesson@richmond.ca](mailto:cjesson@richmond.ca)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 17 November 2016 13:28  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Subject:** Housing Controls

Dear Mayor Brodie and City of Richmond Councillors,

I add my voice to the concerns about Richmond's housing controls and the lack of a holistic approach to lot development. Richmond's vision of becoming the most appealing, livable and well-managed community will not come to fruition if the current approach to housing continues unaltered and unabated.

Community development requires strategies to build relationships between residents in local neighbourhoods. Allowing brick walls, gates and other structures that impede access to front doors clearly sends a message that neighbours are not welcome and neighbourhoods are not safe. It projects a sense of insecurity and distrust, of third-world gated compounds.

Since neighbours are not getting to know each other, they tend to congregate in locations outside of their residential neighbourhoods (restaurants, clubs, sports and entertainment facilities, etc.). Even with Richmond's much improved

public transit system, far too many choose to travel by car, necessitating multicar garages. The end result is that much of the lot is taken up with garages and driveways. This is not congruent with your Environment and Sustainability goals.

Most new homes on my street have 3-4 garages and driveways that consume nearly all of the land in the front of the building. Landscaping is practically non-existent, and what does get planted tends to favour marketing the home to offshore buyers, and not to improve our environment. Why is it that builders are allowed to remove large deciduous and coniferous trees and replace them with short palm trees? Has anyone even considered what impact this has to our already declining songbird population? What birds forage and nest in palm trees?

I petition you to

1. **Decrease the footprint of homes on lots and to increase green space requirements.** This includes increasing the percentage of landscaped property and requiring the planting of larger deciduous and coniferous trees in the front yard and back yard. Non-native trees such as palm trees should be prohibited. Protection of large mature trees has to become a priority before Richmond's skyline is reduced to rooftops instead of healthy vibrant environment-enhancing trees.
2. **Limit driveways to 6 meters in width** (e.g. Surrey, Delta) to increase landscaped areas. All new driveways must be water permeable.
3. **Eliminate brick walls, gates and other structures from the front property line.**
4. **Change your lot development processes to deal with all aspects of the lot,** including landscaping, interface with neighbourhood, and reducing the impact to our environment. Please stop enabling builders to construct houses for the sake of feeding the real estate market. The whole lot needs to be considered in developing a healthy home that adds to the neighbourhood and its local community, and not solely to the pockets of the real estate market players who have no long-term vested interest in the neighbourhood.

Respectfully yours,



**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: 2nd round of amendments to building by laws

**From:** MayorandCouncillors

**Sent:** Friday, 18 November 2016 14:56

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: 2nd round of amendments to building by laws

Dear [REDACTED],

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence. Copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. Your correspondence has also been forwarded to Mr. Wayne Craig, Director, Development and also Mr. Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals for information.

Please feel free to be in touch with Wayne and/or Gavin at 604-276-4000 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Regards,

Claudia

**Claudia Jesson**

**Manager, Legislative Services**

**City Clerk's Office**

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

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

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, 16 November 2016 22:21

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Subject:** 2nd round of amendments to building by laws

Dear councillors,

I live in Richmond for over 40 years and i am very sad that the place i call home has changed drastically for the last 10 years.

Beautiful mature trees were cut down for new developements. A lot of beautiful landscaping and green spaces were gone.

Hundreds of ugly big mansions were built into our neighbourhood, taking away the green space we enjoy . Most of the mansions does not fit right into our neighbourhood ,making the rest of us look like servant quarters. Their detached

workshop turned into 3-4-5 car garage . Those mansions block out the sunshine to their neighbouring houses and no more

green spaces left. How can the city hall approve such buildings without any consideration to the rest of Richmond residences

what happen to the street appeal?

**PLN # 218**

I strongly against the building of gates, brick wall at their entrances. We never have a chance to know and talk to the new neighbour plus most of them do not care about the lawn beyond the gate. They use the gate as the dividing line for their property and not their property. The cold neighbour never say Hi to anyone or there is just no one live there.

Please stop the harm you had already done to us, making most of our friends selling their houses and move away from Richmond.

Please consider the street appeal and green space , the awkward imbalance of those mansions to ours before you approve the building permit.

Please rescue Richmond

Thanks



## Konkin, Barry

---

**Subject:** FW: Upcoming City Planning Committee Nov 22 2016 meeting on regulating oversized houses

**From:** MayorandCouncillors

**Sent:** Monday, 21 November 2016 08:49

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Upcoming City Planning Committee Nov 22 2016 meeting on regulating oversized houses

Dear [REDACTED],

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence. Copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. Your correspondence has also been forwarded to Mr. Wayne Craig, Director, Development and also Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals for information.

Please feel free to be in touch with Wayne and/or Gavin at 604-276-4000 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Regards,  
Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

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

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Saturday, 19 November 2016 13:37

**To:** MayorandCouncillors [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Upcoming City Planning Committee Nov 22 2016 meeting on regulating oversized houses

Dear Mayor and Council:

[REDACTED] are STRONGLY OPPOSED to construction of OVERSIZED HOUSES in Richmond.

Over 100 people or 98% of the neighbours have already signed a petition against Monster and Oversized houses in our neighbourhood. This was presented to the Council in early September. We are therefore very surprised to hear that the Municipality of Richmond is meeting on November 22 2106 (Richmond Planning Committee Meeting) to discuss regulating oversized houses. Do not open the door to oversized houses as they add nothing to the neighbourhood. They destroy the ambience of a neighbourhood; and the sense of community is fractured because they don't fit in. They stick out like a small hotel. Richmond is supposed to be known as a friendly municipality but it is losing that distinction, as it allows this type of development to occur without any regard to the wishes of the community. It seems as though the developers have the ear of the

Richmond Municipality more so than the people that live and work in Richmond that make the community the livable place that it is.

There have been many many people that have written in the local newspapers and the Vancouver Sun and Province complaining and voicing strong opposition to oversized houses. People throughout the GVRD have made it plain that they don't want them. I don't know what could be made clearer to the Council or the Planning Committee- oversized houses are NOT wanted. There was an article in November 19 2016 Vancouver Sun. I have included the whole article but I have taken out pieces that are vital for Richmond if it to keep its goal as a livable city.

## **Preserving wealthy district's charms will be top of mind for many voters**

1. Issues surrounding the North Shore's constant development, preserving neighbourhood character, transit and the lack of affordable housing in one of Canada's wealthiest municipalities are top of mind in the civic byelection, which was called after three-term Coun. Michael Lewis, 66, died in August of lung cancer. "There's a strong move to look for other types of housing options rather than huge single family," said Mayor Michael Smith on Friday.
2. Candidate Carolanne Reynolds said in her platform statement that with pressure on neighbourhoods, "my focus is to protect local character, and to establish special zones to provide diversity. We must do a better job of listening to our residents
3. Candidate Tom Dodd said there are ways for zoning, planning and development bylaws to encourage the retention of older homes while encouraging small-scale, lowrise and more affordable housing. "Done correctly, this can maintain our comfortable village-like atmosphere, provide downsizing opportunities for our seniors, and possibly provide housing that would allow more of our kids, young families and the people employed in West Vancouver to actually live here."

The neighbourhood has made it very plain, NO MONSTER or OVERSIZED HOUSES. They do not fit into the ambience of the neighbourhood or any neighbourhood where we have seen them.

There is also a possibility that these oversized houses could become Airbnb which would be a disaster for Richmond neighbourhoods and could easily spring up if oversized house are allowed. That would just destroy the character of the neighbourhood. Many stories have been written in the papers about these Airbnb places with all night parties, car all over the place, garbage left all over the place. We dont' want them and I could see that kind of rental happening. We are close to the airport which is a perfect location for an Airbnb

## **Interested in renting your house short-term? Some tips 1- November 19 2016 Vancouver Sun**

ZoomBookmarkSharePrintListenTranslate

Dara Choubak and June Cormack wanted a little help with the mortgage payments on their five-bedroom home in Nelson.

But rather than take on a fulltime roommate, the couple opted to list their guest bedroom on the short-term rental site Airbnb.

"It's nice to be able to have a little bit of an extra income to help us with the mortgage, but not have to commit to having somebody in our space for a long period of time," says Cormack.

THE ARTICLE CONTINUES BUT IT WAS JUST THIS SECTION THAT IS INTERESTING IE OVERSIZED HOME AIRBNB

Mayor and council

If you need any clarification on the above please email me or phone [REDACTED]. Address is [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

COUNCIL NOTE THE STATEMENT BELOW AND TAKE HEED.

## Preserving wealthy district's charms will be top of mind for many voters

If you need any clarification on the above please email me or phone [REDACTED]. Address is [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Large turnout expected for West Van byelection 3

ZoomBookmarkSharePrintListenTranslate

## Preserving wealthy district's charms will be top of mind for many voters

I think residents would like to see development slowed in North Vancouver, because traffic is getting really heavy.

When West Vancouver's 31,000 potential voters head to the polls Saturday, they'll have much to think about when they cast their ballots.

**Issues surrounding the North Shore's constant development, preserving neighbourhood character, transit and the lack of affordable housing in one of Canada's wealthiest municipalities are top of mind in the civic byelection, which was called after three-term Coun. Michael Lewis, 66, died in August of lung cancer.**

**"There's a strong move to look for other types of housing options rather than huge single family," said Mayor Michael Smith on Friday.** "That's the kind of housing (needed) for our seniors, people wanting to downsize and, specifically, for young families who want housing options to stay in our community.

"The other big issue is transportation and traffic. I think our residents would like to see development slowed in North Vancouver, because traffic is getting really heavy. They (new North Vancouver residents) are coming to West Van to walk the seawall, use our rec centre and our parks. And that puts extra traffic on our residential streets from outside West Vancouver."

Smith said other issues are the prospect of a new east-west connector road built across the North Shore — "that's a huge issue; it would go behind Park Royal (and) across the Capilano River" — as well as the idea of a possible SkyTrain connection under Burrard Inlet.

A dozen candidates are vying for the spot on council and voter turnout could be heavy. "We had 937 votes cast in the four days of advanced voting," said the district's communications director Jeff McDonald. "We consider that pretty good."

**Candidate Carolanne Reynolds said in her platform statement that with pressure on neighbourhoods, "my focus is to protect local character, and to establish special zones to provide diversity. We must do a better job of listening to our residents while addressing traffic/parking, waterfront, environment, Ambleside Town Centre, Official Community Plan and our budget."**

**Candidate Tom Dodd said there are ways for zoning, planning and development bylaws to encourage the retention of older homes while encouraging small-scale, lowrise and more affordable housing.**



**“Done correctly, this can maintain our comfortable village-like atmosphere, provide downsizing opportunities for our seniors, and possibly provide housing that would allow more of our kids, young families and the people employed in West Vancouver to actually live here.”**



Candidate David Jones said areas that need addressing are traffic congestion, scarcity of business-area parking, employee shortages, rapid transit and infrastructure upgrades and maintenance.



TO: MAYOR & EACH  
COUNCILLOR  
FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2016 10:36 AM

**To:** McNulty,Bill; Au,Chak; Day,Carol; Steves,Harold; McPhail,Linda

**Subject:** Planning Committee (November 22) - single family building massing

*To Planning - Nov 22, 2016  
Re: Item # 2.*


Hello Planning Committee members,

Thank you for continuing your work to address building massing controls. These latest recommendations by staff are a good start to restoring balance to Richmond's building bylaws. Many of these recommendations described by staff are practical housekeeping items that are common sense. The reality is that the changes correcting backyards, front yards, and green space coverage need to be adopted in their entirety. This will also benefit the City's plans to emphasize tree protection in 2017.

Adopting these changes will mean that Richmond will be encouraging average sized backyards, typical side yard setbacks, and normal front yard layouts when compared to other Metro Vancouver communities. In this instance aiming to be average is not a bad thing.

Your efforts are appreciated.

[REDACTED]



**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: Tree protection and building envelopes

**From:** MayorandCouncillors

**Sent:** Tuesday, 22 November 2016 11:53

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Tree protection and building envelopes

Dear Mr. Guthrie,

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence. Copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. Your correspondence has also been forwarded to Mr. Wayne Craig, Director, Development and also Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals for information.

Please feel free to be in touch with Wayne and/or Gavin at 604-276-4000 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Regards,  
Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

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

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, 21 November 2016 14:16

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Subject:** Tree protection and building envelopes

Hello Mr. Mayor and Councillors:

We would like to voice support for staff's work looking at strengthening our tree protection bylaws and especially reducing the building envelopes for single family homes.

These changes are critical to bring balance back to our neighborhoods, to give more room for trees and green space (critical to environmental health) and to give us more privacy.

We would like the Planning Committee and rest of Council to be aware of our support as we are away and cannot attend to Nov. 22 meeting.

Regards

[REDACTED]

**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: Massing regulation : second phase (22nd November, 2016)

**From:** MayorandCouncillors

**Sent:** Wednesday, 23 November 2016 08:34

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Massing regulation : second phase (22nd November, 2016)

Dear [REDACTED],

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence. Copies of your email have been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. Your correspondence has also been forwarded to Mr. Wayne Craig, Director, Development and also Gavin Woo, Senior Manager, Building Approvals for information.

Please feel free to be in touch with Wayne and/or Gavin at 604-276-4000 if you have any further questions or concerns.

Regards,  
Claudia

**Claudia Jesson**

**Manager, Legislative Services**

**City Clerk's Office**

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

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

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, 22 November 2016 15:09

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

**Subject:** Massing regulation : second phase (22nd November, 2016)

Honorable Mayor, council and staff,

Thank you for continuing to look into ways to reduce the negative impacts of massive homes for neighbors, community and to the earth. As I try to think about why massive homes are a problem two questions come to my mind:

What is being taken out of the lot to build these massive new homes and what is being put back in, especially into the areas defined as setbacks and close to the lot boundaries?

I think what is being taken out is the green space: the trees, the grass and the plantings and what is being put back in are massive paved driveways , 3-car garages ,accessory buildings, projections into minimal side yard setbacks, tall unbroken boundary walls (that are 5 m high) and masonry fences and metal gates.

I believe that an excess in this kind of formulaic building is what is causing significant damage. Tall boundary walls and projections into setbacks impact sunlight and privacy of neighbors. Paved driveways and paved over front yards leave no room for mature trees and plantings to be saved. Since the bylaw has very minimal specifications for the percentage of the lot that needs to stay green and does not specify the number of trees that need to be minimally planted, this scenario is repeated many times over. As a result, Richmond is losing trees and green spaces at an astronomical pace especially on private property even as the city continues to plant trees on public lands. I think the council needs to consider all measures that will retain and expand the green footprint of new homes and mandate this clearly through its building bylaws because the existing bylaw is clearly not doing enough to support this cause.

At a macro level, the cumulative effects of paving over front and back yards is increased run off of rain water and allowing this practice to continue seems short sighted at a time when climate change and rising sea levels are already threatening coastal cities such as Richmond.

I feel proud that so far Richmond has opposed the removal of the Massey tunnel and the building of a 10-lane bridge in its place. The city's decision to oppose a fuel pipeline through the Fraser river estuary and the many other green recycling and garbage reduction practices give me a sense of hope that the city has a strong and authentic pro-environment mandate. However, I am puzzled by the fact that even as the city is making sound environmental choices on one hand; new homes within the existing bylaw continue to build three car garages that push the livable space to the back of the lot and negatively impact the size and privacy of rear yards and shrink green space. In a real sense, making room for more cars within our homes will only dilute the need for public transportation and reduce mobility and economic opportunities for many people who depend on public transport to travel between home and work.

I am neither against developers nor against development, I only stand against mindless building practices whose real costs are being invisibly passed onto neighbors , the community and as I have tried to explain in my letter, to the earth.

In the report that has been submitted to the council today (22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2016), the planning staff has examined all of these problematic building practices and suggested concrete solutions to

reduce the excesses of massive home building on single family lots. They have also wisely protected the small lots (less than 28 m deep and less than 372 m<sup>2</sup>) from any negative impact from increased regulatory bylaws related to setbacks. However, I also noticed that in each case the staff has also left a “status quo” option for the council, in case you decide not to do anything about an issue.

I hope this freedom of choice will compel each of you to think more deeply and responsibly about the direction in which you want to steer Richmond’s building practices. I believe the issue of addressing the excesses of the massive home-building trend in Richmond is not about who you stand with. Rather, it is an issue about what you stand for.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## **Brodie, Malcolm**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January-18-17 12:05 PM  
**To:** Brodie, Malcolm  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed Building Bylaw Amendments

**Importance:** High

Dear Mayor Brodie and City Council,

### **Re: Proposed Building Bylaw Amendments for Single Family Development (the "proposed Amendments")**

I am writing in response to the proposed Amendments. I am opposed to the proposed Amendments and they cause me great concern.

I read our local Richmond newspapers, and I hear arguments from both sides. It seems that there is a battle going on between Builders on the one hand, and, for lack of a better term, the "Anti-Builders group", on the other.

To summarize, the Anti-Builders have taken the position that large ("mega") homes are causing a loss of community. Let me begin by saying that I am part of the "community" that is being discussed. I moved to Richmond as a teenager more than 26 years ago to attend the University of British Columbia. My wife also attended UBC. I am a lawyer and she is a teacher.

My father, [REDACTED], is known to many of you, and he is actively involved in the community.

My two children were born at Richmond General Hospital. My oldest attends Steveston London Secondary School and my youngest goes to an elementary school in Richmond. My kids play ice hockey, soccer, basketball, etc.. in Richmond. Likewise, my parents, my brother, his wife and children are also residents and part of the community in Richmond, as are my wife's parent's, sister and family, and numerous friends in similar situations. My wife and I have worked very hard and now are in a position to build our dream home in Richmond. Yet, these proposed Amendments unfairly target people like my wife and I.

### **Maximum length/setbacks/site coverage**

In Richmond, we are not permitted to build basements because essentially the land is too shallow. If I was able to build a two storey home with the third storey basement below ground, I would happily do so as that would reduce my building envelope and increase my yard size. Unfortunately, all of us who wish to build our homes in Richmond need to do so above ground and that, naturally, means a larger building envelope/footprint. I grew up in a small town in BC before moving to Richmond. Like my home in that small town, I would love to have a big yard, but in order to build my home the way that I want, I have no choice but to sacrifice some yard.

My house plan shows that my home is being designed to entertain friends and family. What could be more "community" than that?

Restricting the maximum length/setbacks/site coverage of proposed homes like mine does not enhance "community". Rather, it punishes members of the community who have worked hard and earned the right to enjoy their homes; these changes will either force people to leave the community or, for those who don't have the option to leave, or live unhappily.

## Restricting Garage Capacity and Increasing Gate Setbacks

I find these proposals alarming. In my view, the current garage square foot allowance of 538 sf is adequate but by no means excessive. This proposed Amendment accomplishes nothing. Members of the community such as myself use our garages to park our vehicles, to store lawn mowers, gardening tools, our kids' sports equipment, bikes, etc... Given the square footage restrictions we already deal with, it is again unfair to take away space that we all need. In fact, the proposal could lead to some of the aforementioned items being left outside which would increase the risk of crime.

I take serious issue with the proposal to significantly increase gate setbacks from the property line. First, let's be clear, gates do not in any way diminish "community". Growing up I constantly heard about the proverbial dream of having a home with a "white picket fence." There was never any type of negative connotation with a white picket fence. It was not seen as an anti-neighbour concept.

Today's "white picket fences" are simply more stylish. As the architect of my plans so eloquently put it to me, gates result in crime prevention through environmental design. They act as a deterrent, yet they are aesthetically pleasing to neighbours. Richmond's gates are not 10 foot walls or gated communities, they are more inviting. Similarly, I plan to make a gate that flows with my house design, is aesthetically pleasing, and looks stylish. My proposed gate will only be a deterrent but it will be easy for anyone to jump over (it).

Second, the appropriate place for a gate is on the property line. In my house plans, the proposed setback would essentially place the gate inside my Media Room. What could that possibly accomplish?

There may be certain situations in which a gate setback makes sense, such as a particular arterial road. However, on my property, such a setback would make no sense. Each property should be looked at on a case by case basis. A blanket policy to set back gates across Richmond is unjust and unduly harsh. If this is an issue, give staff reasonable discretion to assess each property and give valid reasons why on a particular property a gate setback from the property line is required.

The Garage Capacity and Gate setbacks have become a red herring. They are not the problems.

My own personal view is that EMPTY homes are the problem. I would not oppose a vacancy tax as established in Vancouver. If homes are empty, it is more difficult to build community.

There are many Richmond residents in my situation. How does Richmond benefit if we all move out of Richmond so that we can properly build our dream homes in other cities? Quite the contrary, this would result in more harm to the community and to the fabric of Richmond.

This isn't just about Builders versus Anti-Builders. There are many people in my situation who are being unfairly targeted and penalized by the proposed Amendments. The Amendments approved last year have already caused harm: I still remain unconvinced restricting ceiling heights in any way enhances "community". It is unfair to continue to spontaneously propose amendments that diminish the enjoyment of homes by "community" members like myself.

It is trite to say that anyone who has purchased property in Richmond in the last few years has paid a significant price, and for most of us the property is our most valuable asset. We have the right to enjoy that asset within reasonable restrictions, and these proposed Amendments are not reasonable.

I want to continue to live here in Richmond for a long time with my wife and children, and my parents and my friends.

I urge you and request that you oppose the proposed Amendments.

Regards,





---

This email transmission and any accompanying attachments may be subject to solicitor/client privilege or may contain confidential or privileged information. Any use of the information by unintended recipients is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please delete it and the attachments immediately and contact me by telephone or email. Thank you.

**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: Massification open houses and New construction next door at 11400 Kingfisher drive

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 22 January 2017 07:22  
**To:** Cooper, James  
**Subject:** Massification open houses and New construction next door at 11400 Kingfisher drive

Hi Mr Cooper,

I thank you and your staff and all the planners for putting up the first open house for the 2nd stage of massification at South Arm. The staff was very available and clear in answering questions and clarifying concepts. However, I do think that a series of presentations about the suggested changes followed by questions and answers may be a more effective format because residents and developers get an overview. There is less chance of ideas getting misinterpreted and through questions and answers the various stakeholders get to hear and perhaps engage with each other's point of view. I also feel that the last question on the feedback form (# 17) is not very clear in conveying that it refers to how measuring the grade affects overall height.

On a separate note, I want to let you know that the lot (11400 Kingfisher Drive) just South of me has a fallen tree behind their tree protection fence. I have my suspicions about this tree falling down because I had noticed the builder moving the tree protection fence on the 10th of January and asked him why he was moving the fence. He said that the owner (who had put up the fence) did not know where to put it and the lot went deeper. Not suspecting any foul play, I let the matter be. Now that the tree has fallen down I see the builder's action in a different light. I am pretty puzzled by this because the tree is completely out of the way of the proposed building and on a city right of way right by the north east corner of the house within a foot of the existing fence.

This is a tree protection issue and I am not requesting help from you in bringing this to the notice of the Tree protection staff. I am sharing this experience as an emblematic experience for ordinary citizens such as me and how the culture of "dream homes" affects us today in Richmond.

After much debate with myself, I have reported this event to the tree protection people. I felt conflicted about reporting this because I feel grateful to the new homeowners in agreeing to build a two storey home instead of going 3-storey on their LUC lot. In turn, I've tried to be a good neighbor by supporting their variance application in writing with the city and with other neighbors. As a gesture of goodwill, I allowed the demolishers to use my water and electricity without any charge in order to get the old house ready for demolition.

I feel that if I keep silent about my suspicions about the fallen tree, I am doing the expedient thing: Trying to hold my peace because I have many other issues to negotiate with the new homeowners including when to put up the shared fence. Also they will be my future neighbors and I would like to build trust and goodwill with them. But this has been difficult in the light of this incident .

Some people building in Richmond today want to cherry pick rules that they would like to follow and those they would like to flout or manipulate and unfortunately the burden of safeguarding community and environmental rights has fallen to ordinary citizens without sufficient power or information.

The planning staff's presentation about the 2nd step in massing controls assures me that the staff seems to understand quite clearly what ails the current milieu of single family home construction in Richmond; I hope the council can see it too. I remember a comment one of the builders had made in 2015 : That this is a social problem and an architectural fix won't be effective. I think this is a problem arising from absent or weak architectural and bylaw controls and it is causing serious ill will between neighbors and eroding communities in Richmond today

Regards and best wishes,



**Konkin, Barry**

---

**Subject:** FW: City of Richmond BC - General Comments, Compliments and Questions - Case [0217-CS-COMMENT-009848] Received

**From:** [donotreply@richmond.ca](mailto:donotreply@richmond.ca) [mailto:donotreply@richmond.ca]

**Sent:** Friday, 10 February 2017 16:14

**To:** InfoCentre

**Subject:** City of Richmond BC - General Comments, Compliments and Questions - Case [0217-CS-COMMENT-009848] Received



Attention: Administrator

A general comment, compliment, or question has been submitted through the City of Richmond online Feedback Form. Below is the information which was provided by the person submitting the feedback.

**General Comments, Compliments and Questions**

Category: Comment

**Comment/Compliment/Question:**

The on-line survey re Massing Regulations did not contain Board 10 which was on display at open house, City Hall Feb. 9.

Please consider giving some thought to providing the building department with the input of an architectural vetting expert in order to minimize the questionable styling shown by the four front elevations on Board 10, looks like Medieval Modern.

There are numerous new homes with a distinct design that look astoundingly good, but also some that will always diminish the appearance of the whole immediate neighbourhood. I suggest that no, one is not entitled to build exactly what they might think they want at the time if that clearly impacts the character of the rest of the street. Often a small change may be sufficient to allow that particular design to fit in without detracting from those around it. Please discuss this adequately.

The other comment was re setback for garden shed - it was explained that 4 ft. was required for access. Might 3 ft. do?



**Tech Information:**

Submitted By: 199.175.130.61

Submitted On: Feb 10, 2017 04:13 PM

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.

**PLN + 234**

## Konkin, Barry

---

**Subject:** FW: Zoning Changes

**From:** MayorandCouncillors

**Sent:** Tuesday, 14 February 2017 09:08

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Zoning Changes

Dear [REDACTED],

This is to acknowledge and thank you for your correspondence to Richmond City Council. A copy of your email has been forwarded to the Mayor and each Councillor. In addition, your correspondence has also been forwarded to appropriate staff.

Thank you for taking the time to write to Richmond City Council.

Sincerely,

Claudia

**Claudia Jesson**

**Manager, Legislative Services**

**City Clerk's Office**

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

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

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Friday, 10 February 2017 17:44

**To:** MayorandCouncillors

**Subject:** Zoning Changes

Good Afternoon, I am writing again to the Mayor and Councillors as this is my last effort at giving my voice about the current zoning bylaws. I feel I have to further explain our neighbourhood, although unique, I feel there are many properties/neighbourhoods having the same dilemma

I live on Bird Road, eastside of the tracks off of Shell Road. We have many large lots on the north side of our road. Most lots are 220 in depth and range from 66 feet wide to 100 feet wide. Our lot is 88 wide by 220 depth, just under 1/2 acre. Currently the homes on this side of our street are not allowed to subdivide under 100 feet wide. What is allowed on these large lots, is a home 4000 sq/ft to 6000 sq/ft to be built.

What is happening with the current zoning bylaws in this area is, that it allows for larger homes to extremely encroach on the older ones. What ever happened to building scheme relative to the current older homes? I feel the city has not taken this into consideration and has allowed these homes to be built just because they are large lots and have not considered us that have smaller homes.

We have approximately 6 homes (older homes) left on our side of the street, we have lost our privacy to the monster homes as these homes are being constructed with a large depth and width. They encroach into our back yard view and tower over us. Trees get torn down, even though there is a bylaw, drainage problems occur as they sit higher than us. Gated homes reflect, "stay out". Our neighbourhood is not the same as when we first moved here. This is truly sad.

On the other side of the street, we also have a handful of older homes left. These lots are quite smaller. Many people are leaving for different reasons, but I feel in my opinion, it is no longer their neighbourhood they once knew and loved. I feel the city has done a dis service to Richmond Residents.

Now I am not saying that people should not build elaborate homes, I just feel that the setbacks and height and length need to be drastically decreased and the older homes that remain in the area need to be taken into consideration before issuing the permits for these monstrosities.

Why not allow two homes to be built on lots 80+ wide. Make them smaller so they don't encroach on the older homes. Right now a home (bungalow rancher) has been sold and is currently rented out. I do know without a doubt it will be torn down, its just a matter of when. With the currently bylaws that are in place it will allow for one of these mega homes. That means that I will most surely have a wall of windows looking right into my backyard which is a place of quite serenity now. My neighbour has had the same thing happen to them and don't feel they can enjoy their back yard anymore.

I love my neighbourhood and want to continue living here, but if this kind of zoning continues, I will no longer enjoy my neighbourhood and will move on like others.

Lastly, these zoning bylaws need to take effect once decided. Not a process that takes 1-3 years. I am not sure if we can wait that long. I also want to point out that the survey that is currently available to residents on "lets talk Richmond" was a great idea and allows for people to voice their concerns and opinions without prejudice. However, it is a very cumbersome survey and needs to be simplified. It is very confusing and takes too long to complete. The average person in my opinion will give up. It has to be a simple yes and no survey. Just food for thought. As mentioned in my last letter, I hope the City Councillors do not utilize the survey and open house meetings solely for their decision. Many people just don't want to complain. Just take a look around and you will see of what I speak of.

I know you all have a tough decision to make and that you have been inundated by lots of complaints, letters, etc. But this has gone on far too long and needs to be changed.

Thank you for your consideration and thoughtful process.

Regards,



# Richmond Home Builders Group *Builders Choice - Builders Voice*

Review of:

## Proposed Amendments to Single Family Zoning Bylaw 8500 Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation – Second Phase

The Richmond Home Builders Group (RHBG) represents a growing number of residential developers, builders, designers and other industry related professionals. Our goal is to be the *Builders Choice - Builders Voice*, helping build better homes and better communities throughout Richmond.

Richmond Home Builders Group, its members and affiliates are responsible for majority of the construction of single family homes in the City of Richmond. RHBG is in a unique position to understand the differences between real and perceived issues that have been raised by the public.

As city staff have requested:

***“... invite you to learn about and provide comments on options for updating the Richmond Zoning Bylaw to regulate single family residential development to improve single family house design...”***

RHBG has reached out to both its membership and independent developers, builders and home designers to review the proposed changes. Together we have examined homes built prior to the changes passed in Bylaw 9280, Sep 14/15; homes designed and built after the Bylaw 9280 changes; as well as designing and modelling homes based on the proposed changes.

The following is RHBG's review & comments on the proposed amendments to Single Family Zoning Bylaw 8500 Single Family Dwelling Building Massing Regulation - Second Phase. We believe this to be a thoughtful balanced response to what is being proposed.



Richmond Home Builders Group  
#2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca




# Maximum House Depth

Maximum House Depth  
Applied to 60ft & 40ft Wide Lots

## Proposed Maximum Depth of House

- limit the maximum physical depth of a house while still maintaining the allowable house size.
- OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):  
No limitations to overall depth of house— Minimum front and rear setbacks
- OPTION 2:  
Continuous length of wall limited to 55% of total lot depth
- OPTION 3:  
Continuous length of wall limited to 50% of total lot depth



Mirrored Articulation

Independent Articulation

Richmond Home Builders Group  
#2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca



Proposed Bylaw  
Building Depth  
A2



# Proposed Maximum House Depth Shadow Study

## Maximum Depth of House

- limit the maximum physical depth of a house while still maintaining the allowable house size.
- OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):  
No limitations to overall depth of house— Minimum front and rear setbacks
- OPTION 2:  
Continuous length of wall limited to 55% of total lot depth
- OPTION 3:  
Continuous length of wall limited to 50% of total lot depth


## Comments & Recommendations

- Proposed Maximum Depth of House:
- orientation resulting from depth of house articulation likely to be towards the side yard.
  - likely to create dark and undesirable over sized side yard spaces, high risk space will be used to store things such as gardening equipment/tools, lawn furniture, compost, lumber, etc., creating an nuisance sightline for the neighbouring property.
  - will make minimal difference in the access to additional daylight or privacy for the neighbouring property
  - At 2.4m (8ft) articulation will not overcome the shadowing of a two story single home.
  - will be unworkable on lot widths less than 40 feet as there will be a greater loss of side setback making the side yard being recessed over 12 feet from the property line, creating a great loss of functional design and space.
  - the proposed rear yard changes will provide better improvements to the neighbour's access to daylight than the proposed building depth inward articulation.
  - changes passed in Bylaw 9280, Sep 14/15 including the revised building envelope and the garage height reduction has already addressed this issue.


## RHBG Recommends:

- no further changes and supports Option 1 (Status Quo)

## Mirrored Articulation



## Independent Articulation



\* shadows based on south facing rear yards on June 21st at 5:00 pm (sunset 9:21pm)


**Proposed Bylaw**  
Building Depth Analysis  
**A3**

Richmond Home Builders Group  
#2240 - 4871 Shell Rd.  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca



# Proposed Rear Yard Setbacks

Proposed Rear Yard Setbacks  
Applied to 60 x 120 Lots



## REAR YARD SETBACKS

### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

Continue to require 6.0 m (20ft) minimum rear yard setback.

### OPTION 2:

60% of the first storey can be set back 6 m (20ft) from the rear property line, the rest of the first storey (min. 40%) must be set back at least 7.5 m (25ft).

If the house has a second or half storey above, all of that portion of the rear wall must be set back at least 7.5 m (25ft) from the rear property line.

### OPTION 3:

The minimum rear yard setback would be the greater of 6.0 m (20ft), or 25% of the total lot depth, up to a maximum required setback of 10.7 m (35ft).

**PLN - 240**

Option 2

Status Quo


Option 3



Richmond Home Builders Group  
#2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca

**Proposed Bylaw**  
Rear Yard  
**A4**

# Proposed Rear Yard Setback Sun Study (60x120 lots)



Proposed Option 3

Status Quo Option 1

Proposed Option 2

## REAR YARD SETBACKS

- OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):**  
Continue to require 6.0 m (20ft) minimum rear yard setback.
- OPTION 2:**  
60% of the first storey can be set back 6 m (20ft) from the rear property line, the rest of the first storey (min. 40%) must be set back at least 7.5 m (25ft).  
If the house has a second or half storey above, all of that portion of the rear wall must be set back at least 7.5 m (25ft) from the rear property line.
- OPTION 3:**  
The minimum rear yard setback would be the greater of 6.0 m (20ft), or 25% of the total lot depth, up to a maximum required setback of 10.7 m (35ft).

## Comments & Recommendations

- Proposed Rear Yard Setbacks:**
- the 6 meter rear yard setback has been in use for 25 years or more.
  - increasing to 25% (maximum 35 ft) likely to create tall 2 storey blank rear facades as builders and designers struggle to accommodate interior programming.
  - 60/40 split rear yard likely to create more varied and interesting rear facades, as well as achieving the same goals of privacy and access to daylight as would be with the building depth inward articulation proposal.


## RHBG Recommends two revised options:

- Option 2 - 60/40 Rear Yard Split** with the exception if a lot is less than 33m deep and less than 6,000 sq ft. in area, the minimum rear yard setback be 6.0m.
- Option 3 -** The minimum rear yard setback would be the greater of 6.0m (20ft), or 20% of the total lot depth, up to a maximum required setback of 10m, with the exception if a lot is less than 33m deep and less than 6,000 sq ft in the area the minimum rear yard setback be 6.0m.
- As was suggested in Planning Committee's November 22, 2016 letter to Lynda Torberg, RHBG proposes reducing the front yard setback from 20ft. to 15ft. to allow locating new homes further forward, and thus increasing the rear yard. Note, many lots have 10-20 ft. of boulevard beyond the front property line, therefore this will have a minimal effect on the overall streetscape.



# Proposed Garage Projection

Proposed Garage Projection  
Applied to actual house 60 x 120 Lot



## GARAGE PROJECTIONS

limiting how far a garage can project from the front wall of the house toward the street can reduce the appearance of a large single family dwelling and be more compatible with existing single family character.

### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

No restrictions on front garage projections. If required front yard setback is met, there is no limit on garage projection.

### OPTION 2:

Allow a maximum 9.1 m (30 ) projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Three-car garage).

### OPTION 3:

Allow a maximum 7.3 m (24 ) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).

### OPTION 4:

Allow a maximum 6.6 m (21.7 ) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).

PLAN 242




Richmond Home Builders Group  
47240 - 4871, Shell Rd  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca

**Proposed Bylaw**  
Garage Projection  
**A6**

# Proposed Garage Projection Massing Study

Proposed Garage Projection  
Applied to actual house 60 x 120 Lot



PLN - 243

## GARAGE PROJECTIONS

limiting how far a garage can project from the front wall of the house toward the street can reduce the appearance of a large single family dwelling and be more compatible with existing single family character.

### OPTION 1 (STATUS QUO):

No restrictions on front garage projections. If required front yard setback is met, there is no limit on garage projection.

### OPTION 2:

Allow a maximum 9.1 m (30 ) projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Three-car garage).

### OPTION 3:

Allow a maximum 7.3 m (24 ) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).

### OPTION 4:

Allow a maximum 6.6 m (21.7 ) Projection from front wall of house to front wall of garage (Two-car garage).

## Comments & Recommendations

- the "L-shaped" triple car garage style of home has been one of the most commonly designed house in Richmond for 25 years or more.
- for a number of years prior to the changes passed in Bylaw 9280, Sep 14/15, the height and massing of these garages had grown to the point they were negatively impacting the use and enjoyment of neighbouring properties.
- However, changes passed in Bylaw 9280, Sep 14/15 have significantly reduced the impact of the garage massing and allowing better access to daylight for neighbouring properties.

Garage projection limitations are likely to result in Front facing triple garages which will likely:

- create larger garage facades and massing.
  - make the main house facades small and mostly hidden.
  - create streetscape dominated by large garages.
- b) reduce the available off street parking area, pushing more parked cars onto the street
- Richmond has very few lanes and thus off street parking has to be accommodated in the front yard and at the street. The "L-shaped" house has been the perfect solution, which is why it has been successfully built and sold so well.
  - Garage projection limitations that end the "L-shaped" house with the parking plaza may create a whole new set of problems as off street parking becomes more limited which can have even larger negative affect on neighbouring properties.

**Recommend – Option 1 (Status Quo)**

Richmond Home Builders Group  
47240 - 4871 Spell Rd.  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca



**Proposed Bylaw**  
Garage Analysis  
**A7**

**DO'S AND DON'TS FOR A GARAGE:**

**Living area over garage**

*(New zoning by-law amendments propose not building on top of garages! Do we really want more of these style homes?)*



PLN 244

Figure 1: At the Builder's Meeting, city staff suggested to build on top of garage as you will lose square footage in the house. Not a good idea.



Figure 2: Front facing garages will not fit well with all neighbourhoods

**Attached Garage Before & After September 2015**



2016 Approved House under constructed 2017

Approved House prior to September 2015



Approved House prior to September 2015




Figure 3: This is a reverse L-Shape garage, which is in the rear. The proposed inward articulation will make this design unworkable. The reason for the rear yard was to better use the 10ft. ROW on the side.

Richmond Home Builders Group  
 #2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
 Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
 604-825-4433  
 www.myrichmond.ca  
 info@myrichmond.ca



**Proposed Bylaw**  
**Garage Examples**  
**A8**

# Landscaping Bylaw Changes

**Site Coverage & Landscaping**  
 RHBG is of opinion that any decrease in site coverage will reduce the opportunity for rear outdoor living, patios, hot tubs, fire pits, water feature, bbq space and fireplaces. RHBG would like to suggest the use of special materials that can make a huge difference in landscaping for example, use permeable pavers for patios as opposed to regular pavers which allow significantly greater drainage.  
 Figures A & B are examples of landscaped homes under the current bylaw.

Figure C is an example of a Landscaped home under the current bylaw which has been paved over and there has been no enforcement to correct it.

This real issue at hand is bylaw enforcement by the city and does not require a bylaw change, as the need to provide creative landscaping features is very important as it needs to complement the unique design of the houses in the city.

**Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits with less than 2 existing trees**

Recommend — Option 2

**Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements**

Recommend — Option 2



Figure A is an example of a landscaped home under the current bylaw.



Figure B is an example of a landscaped home under the current bylaw.



Figure C is an example of a Landscaped home under the current bylaw which has been paved over and there has been no enforcement to correct it.

Richmond Home Builders Group  
 #2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
 Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
 604-825-4433  
 www.myrichmond.ca  
 info@myrichmond.ca



**Proposed Bylaw**  
**Landscaping Clauses**  
**A9**

**Rear Yard & Side Yard Setbacks for Detached Accessory Buildings Greater Than 10m**

The real issue at hand is not the setbacks but the height of these buildings. Limiting the height of the accessory building would provide more relief to neighbors from the side and rear yard with respect to privacy and sight concerns.

The proposed 2.4m accessory setback will create large, undesirable side yard space due to moving the accessory building far into the yard, unless the lot is very large in depth and width. The opportunity to create creative landscaping will be greatly reduced and inevitably create undesirable massing.

RHBC would like to request to know how many single-family home permits were issued with accessory buildings in the past 6 months?

**Recommend Option 1 – Status Quo**

**PLN 246**  
 RHBC has read the staff report dated November 16 2016, it is apparent that this bylaw, if true, is primarily present on the arterial roads; therefore, this change should not affect the homes on inside/local roads and subdivisions.

We ensure that this bylaw is being fairly applied, the Richmond Home Builders Group requests that the city staff conduct and/or provide traffic study showing the number of instances and locations of complaints and actual measured times the electric gates take to open/close and the amount of traffic impeded. Given the varied style of gates, fences, yards, single or shared driveways this bylaw fits the description as being illogical and unworkable.

We agree to the 6m setback on major/minor arterial roads but the front entry gates on inside/local road must remain unchanged (Status Quo). Even on arterial roads, there are still several points of contention such as, what if there are two homes sharing a common driveway or what if a swing gate is used and there is not enough depth on the lot, safety, etc.

**Recommend – Status Quo**


**Building Massing Changes in 2015 (Zoning By-Law 8500)**

Our members (Pre-RHBC) had raised many concerns with the changes that were implemented in the last phase, we had approached city to meet and to discuss our concerns in a timely and courteous manner. However, we are still working with the city to come up with solution to the following issues. We advised the senior staff that the new changes directed by council and implemented to the ceiling heights @ 16'4 feet high, that we were no longer able to achieve the 16'4 height in the new home designs. We advised that the heights have dropped to approx. 14 feet in most cases. The building community has been misinformed and Richmond Home Builders Group requests that a proper review be conducted to evaluate the real effects of the first phase massing study before any other further changes are implemented.

In 2015, when the Zoning By-Law 8500 was voted upon and approved, the council had instructed staff to assess the effects of the new bylaw and to report back to all stakeholders. This was to ensure the measures passed did not negatively affect the building design. At the last Builders Meeting held at the City Hall on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017, the question was raised again if the council directed report had been completed. No answer was provided. RHBC goal is to ensure that the new zoning by-laws are not compromising the legitimacy of the latest Zoning By-Law amendments being proposed and to understand all implications of another change when the previous effects were not even fully realized and understood.

**Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks  
 Recommend Option 2 – To allow for gas fireplace or Hutch**

**Location of Second Story Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards  
 Recommend – Option 2**



**3.5 Specific Richmond Neighbourhoods**

**OBSERVATION:** Richmond has a limited developable urban footprint. There are 16 neighbourhoods in Richmond. The following paper outline propose 2041 planning concepts for consideration when planning each neighbourhood.

Key features in the Plan, such as the City Centre Area, Station Area Plan, the Area Plan or Sub-Area Plan, Land Use Map takes precedence over the following OCP Neighbourhood conceptual maps if there is a discrepancy. The exact location of proposed Neighbourhood Shopping Centre will be determined through further studies and planning process.

City of Richmond Office of Community Planning  
 Date: February 15, 2017

Figure 4: City already breaks down the neighbourhoods into 16 areas.

Connected Neighbourhoods with Better Fit in  
 Connected Neighbourhoods with Better Fit in

**4. Stevenson  
 WEST CHARACTERISTICS**

- a variety of unique heritage character;
- a variety of compact, smaller and larger single family residential lots;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;

**Work:**

- the key commercial node is the historic Stevenson Village which is being conserved in heritage character;
- a few other commercial sites along Chatham Street and Stevenson Highway;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;
- a mix of residential and apartment residential uses scattered throughout the neighbourhood including one or two 7 storey townhomes;

**Plan:**

- Galt of Georgia, Billings, Shepard and Eloum's Walk, Stevenson Community Centre, Grey Point Park, West Elm, S.M. South Arm Fraser River open space and trails;
- Midtown Secondary, John G. Childs, McCreary, MacCall Street, Lord Bess, Westwood and Terminal;
- heritage waterfront village;
- heritage waterfront village;

**MANAGEMENT HIGHLIGHTS**

- identify Stevenson Village subject to the Stevenson Village Heritage Conservation Strategy;
- encourage more walkways and access within the Stevenson neighbourhood for all of Richmond;
- prepare with senior governments and the Stevenson Harbour Authority a unified Stevenson waterfront urban design policy with guidelines;
- assist the JMA in preparing its plan;

**Health:**

- retain waterfront walkways and access;

**Divers:**

- convert time, food residential area to single family residential and residential uses;

**POLICIES:**

- 3.2m Station Area Plan;

Figure 5: From the OCP 9000 report, city already sees each area as being unique. Why not designate a housing style as well.

**Richmond Home Builders Group**  
 #2243 - 4871, Shell Rd.  
 Richmond BC V6X 3T6  
 www.myrichmond.ca  
 info@myrichmond.ca



**Proposed Bylaw  
 Other Bylaw Clauses  
 A10**



# Further Recommendations

Further Recommendations and Considerations for Staff and Council

Richmond Home Builders Group has consulted with several other construction groups and other industry players and can conclude that the current Zoning By-Law 8500 implementation and the proposed amendments are being fast tracked without fully considering all of the ramifications.

RHBG and its members are united in recommending to the city that a One Year Moratorium be imposed on all new building permits. This will allow the city to commission an accurate report and solicit proper input from all stakeholders. The current changes are very disruptive to the design, livability, and salability together these will have a negative economic impact on the entire city.

The City of Richmond has released the OCP 9000 Report and it already lists a breakdown of the entire city into 16 neighborhoods [page 57, 3-19] see A10 figure 4 & 5. The report details each of the areas unique characteristics, management highlights and zoning policies. RHBG is proposing that the city conduct a neighborhood by neighborhood study (example: Westwind, Broadmoor, Seafair, Steveston, Terra Nova, Ironwood, etc. as listed in the report). To determine what type of house designs the residents would like to see in the area. The OCP 9000 report is already indicating that each neighborhood is unique and serves the community in different ways and each offers their own blend of housing styles and designs.

Upon completion of the independent review the city staff can report their findings to council and each neighborhood can be designated its own zoning classification based on several criterions such as.

- i The type of housing styles the residents would like to see built in their area?
- i Type of existing housing stock prevalent in the area?
- i The average age of the homes in their Area?
- i The number of new homes built in the area in the past 10 years?
- i Additional items as deemed necessary to make the process worthwhile.

This is a key to the future of this city and its residents and we don't think that these issues that have risen in the recent years are just a simple coincidence. These issues have risen because there has been an influx of foreign buyers that want to live in this part of the world and are willing to pay for it. Off course, the net effect being an increase in housing demand and a decrease in affordability. Many people that have had their children grow up in the city and then have to watch them move away because they cannot afford to live here without some form of assistance. It is also evident, from several unsavory flyers being distributed in our neighborhoods, that this sudden push to change bylaws to affect the size and style of houses, comments about vehicles some people drive, or their former habits are being highlighted as being un-Canadian. These are not a true representation of our city, but rather a view of a few, narrow-minded individuals. They are making these comments because they are seeing themselves as being economically displaced.

We feel it is time to bring back some affordability to our city and keep our younger families here. How do we do that? For one, if we are able to go into our neighborhoods and look at different forms of development that might suit each zone. Based upon lot sizes and proximity we can diversify and density to multifamily homes where possible, this will create housing that will be more affordable than the a few large homes occupying that same footprint. Once again it needs to be assessed properly to see which areas are best suited as we feel that these issues are the root cause of the many conflicts evident today. If housing can be created in different parts of the world on properties that are less than 25ft wide why can't we be on the forefront of this change to affordability?

RHBG is disappointed that the planning department has adopted a City-Wide approach and are under the impression that one size fits all is going to solve all of the zoning concerns going forward. This approach may have worked in the past; however, it is obvious that this type of thinking will only create avoidable conflicts and tension amongst the city staff, builders, residents and neighbors. Richmond Home Builders Group is very serious and is willing to sacrifice time and money to have this study carried out so the residents of Richmond have access to affordable living. Accordingly, we ask Council and Staff to seriously consider our proposal on implementing a One Year moratorium on all Building Permit applications.

We, the representatives of Richmond Home Builders Group, would like to bring to the council's attention the need for transparency and impartiality when planning zoning by-law changes. There are three groups involved in the process – residents, builders and the city staff. The residents and builders both bring their concerns to the city for overseeing the changes proposed and makes an impartial decision. RHBG would like to get some assurance from the city that any and all amendments proposed are looked at with a proper due process and equal involvement.

A member of our group was able to pull out a publicly available letter from the city's website from a member of the WRAP'd Group member dated September 8th, 2015. The letter contains a lot of similarities. Please see figure 6 below.

The Richmond Home Builders Group concludes that the recommendations and comments outlined are an equitable compromise to what has been presented by city staff as zoning amendments. RHBG strongly urges the city staff to carefully read the proposal and give it the careful consideration it deserves.

Richmond Home Builders Group and its members have made significant positive contributions to the current recognition that the City of Richmond now enjoys on the world stage. Simply analyzing the construction permit fee intake the city now enjoys annually helps to keep property taxes increases to a minimum for all residents of Richmond. It should be noted that this city is also where we live, our children play and where we work. We may not have been here 60 years ago; however, many in our group have lived here for the past 40 years or so. The city does not belong to one resident or one community – it belongs to everyone – equally.

Thank you to the city staff and council for considering our opposition report and being open to feedback about future developmental planning.  
Sincerely,

Richmond Home Builders Group

Richmond Home Builders Group  
#7240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
604-825-4433  
www.myrichmond.ca  
info@myrichmond.ca



**Proposed Bylaw**  
**Further Recommendations**  
**A11**

Schedule 94 to the Minutes of the Public Hearing meeting of the Richmond City Council held on Tuesday, September 8, 2015.

**Mayor and Councillors**

From: Martin Woolford <martin.woolford@vancouver.ca>  
 Sent: Monday, September 8, 2015 9:55 AM  
 To: Mayor and Councillors  
 Subject: September 8 Public Hearing Bylaw 5280



In July, City Council failed on controlling building massing. Mayor and Councillors rejected the advice of the City's own Design Advisory Panel, recommendations from staff and pleas from the public. The Bylaw that is being voted on for final reading appears to be developer driven, and not a response to public concern. Regrowth has to happen but the Bylaw does nothing to improve the situation that is currently allowed to happen, with the initial new construction destroying the livability of our well established communities and sub divisions. It should actually have focused on and addressed ways of improving our city.

- 1 - **Building massing** - The single most effective action to reduce the massing of new homes in Richmond is to reduce the 'double height' standard. Room heights should be 12 feet, as staff have recommended. Not 16.4 feet, as the bylaw proposes. Richmond is the only city in Metro Vancouver that uses 16.4 feet as a normal room height. Vancouver, Surrey and Burnaby limit heights to 12 feet.
- 2 - **Building height** - A 9 metre (29.5 feet) height limit for ALL new houses is needed. No loopholes and wasteful exceptions for 2, 5-storey houses. 3rd storey floor areas must fit within the standard roofline.
- 3 - **Backyards** - Backyards and green space need to be preserved to allow space, privacy and sunshine. There is a Council referral back to staff to investigate the protection of backyards. A date for reporting back is required on:
  - Reducing maximum building depth (to 50% of lot)
  - Increasing rear and side yard setbacks (backyard from minimum 20 ft to at least 30 ft)
  - Rules regarding detached accessory building setbacks
  - Eliminating projections into 4 ft side yard setbacks altogether.
  - Limiting 2nd storey floor areas (to 80% of 1st storey floor area)
  - Incentivize new building footprints that preserve mature trees on site



Yours  
 Martin Woolford (Richmond Resident Since 1988)

Figure 6: Letter from WRAPD Steering Head member to city dated Sept. 8th, 2015. Same recommendations as Planning Dept.

Schedule 2 to the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting of Richmond City Council held on Tuesday, November 22, 2016.

**Lynda Terborg**

To: Lynda Terborg  
 Subject: Overlooking

When I looked over this staff report I was disappointed because I'm an optimist and only optimists can be disappointed when our community leaders continue to miss the message. Negotiations are a give and take but the review for Building Missing Second Phase is all take and not much give.

Richmond started with lots 66' x 120' and larger, with small homes on them. In the seventies the city introduced smaller lots 40 or 50' x 100' on the average. The houses got bigger and the backyards smaller but still often deeper than the minimum setback required. But the important difference between then and now is the lack of concern today for the impacts and how to mitigate and make it better for the old and new to live together in harmony. We are lacking empathy and a concern for our neighbours plight.

Processes such as this one proposed create more disharmony than you can ever appreciate

The pictures you use on the cover are an insult and show a 7 days to Beaver life long past. The lovely backyards in the pictures are overtopped and covered by the new houses being built around. Certainly your pictures are what the new occupants see... but you failed to add the picture of what those old neighbours see when they look back. (I can find you time to use show picture 'overlooked')

The Land use contracts of the seventies increased density, made homes more affordable and wedged people closer together. But the planning and regulations to do that transition used language and I quote: "The purpose is to avoid 'overlooking'... to lessen the visual impact... to maximize privacy in yards, design of individual dwellings shall only be carried out in a comprehensive basis... with regards to setbacks, privacy, sunlight and function are considered."

I don't see those goals expressed in this report. Enhancing compatibility by giving a 4 ft side yard setback and taking it away with a 2 foot projection is not compatible. We no longer install wood burning fireplaces and we don't need projecting chimneys. Starting we have a 6 meter (20 ft) backyard setback and taking it away by allowing a three car garage (20 by 37 ft) to be built, 4 feet off the back fence and calling it an 70 m2 accessory building is worse tactics than those used by sleight of hand snake oil salesmen.

This report is technically too cumbersome for a lay person to assimilate and respond intelligently in an evening walk session with poster boards and handouts. By time it gets to Public Hearing the die is cast and no changes are ever made.

The continuous wall spoken of in "maximum depth of house" is a direct result of the infamous Richmond special L shaped design, including the front yard 20 foot setback, the three car garage, the auto court hard surface, and some with side door entrance...the front door of the house is now well back 50 to 60 feet from the front of the lot. Therefore 50% of the lot is devoted to the car culture. One solution could be to take 5 or 10 feet off the front yards and add it to the backyards. Also putting existing FAR on top of those 700 sq. ft. triple car garages could allow a dedication of an additional 5 feet to the backyard.

The major effects of our new rebuilds on residential properties is not seen when driving down the front of our roads. The catastrophic changes to the backyard and side yard perspectives is the what is most devastating to our well being. It is Richmond's dark secret.

Richmond Home Builders Group  
 #2240 - 4871 Shell Rd  
 Richmond BC V6X 3Z6  
 604-825-4433  
 www.myrichmond.ca  
 info@myrichmond.ca



## Proposed Bylaw Correspondance A12

Figure 7: letter dated November 22, 2016 introduced at Planning Committee Meeting of the same date from Lynda Terborg



---

**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
Amendment Bylaw 9524 (Single Family Building Massing Regulations)**

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

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

- (a) inserting the following definition in the correct alphabetic location:

“**Continuous wall** means an exterior wall on a **single-family dwelling**, which does not include an inward articulation of 2.4 m or more, with a minimum horizontal measurement of 2.4 m.”

- (b) Deleting the definition of **Grade, finished site** in its entirety and replacing it with the following:

“**Grade, finished site** means in Area ‘A’, the average ground elevation identified on a **lot** grading plan approved by the **City**, not exceeding 0.3 m above the highest elevation of the crown of any public **road abutting** the **lot**, and

means in Area ‘B’, the average ground elevation identified on a **lot** grading plan approved by the **City**, not exceeding the following specifications unless approved by the **City**:

- a) 0.6 m above the highest elevation of the crown of any public **road abutting** the **lot**; or
  - b) where the average ground elevation calculated pursuant to a) is more than 1.2 m below the required **flood plain construction level**, the average ground elevation may be increased to 1.2 m below the required **flood plain construction level**.”
- (c) Deleting the definition of **non-porous surfaces** in its entirety and substituting the following:

“**Non-porous surfaces** means any constructed surface on, above or below ground that does not allow precipitation or surface water to penetrate directly into the underlying soil. Surfacing materials

considered as non-porous are concrete, asphalt, and grouted brick or stone.”

2. Section 4.7.1 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“4.7.1 a) The following projections shall be permitted in the **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that permit **single detached housing**. These projections apply to the **single detached housing only**, not other **uses** such as **town housing**, and are subject to the *Building Code*.

b) Notwithstanding a provision for a projection into a **side yard**, the maximum number of projections is one, limited to one side wall of **single detached dwelling unit**, for the purposes of a chimney or fireplace assembly only, and shall not exceed 1.8 m in horizontal length. No masonry footing is permitted for the chimney or fireplace assembly.”

3. Section 4.7.2 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“4.7.2 **Bay windows** and **hutches** which form part of the **principal building** may project for a distance of:

- a) 1.0 m into the **front yard**; and
- b) 0.6 m into the **rear yard**.”

4. Section 4.7.3(b) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“(b) 0.6 m into the **side yard**, limited to one exterior wall of the **single detached dwelling unit**, for the purposes of a chimney or fireplace assembly only, and shall not exceed 1.8 m in horizontal length. No masonry footing is permitted for the chimney or fireplace assembly.”

5. Section 4.7.7(f) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“(f) i) for detached **accessory buildings** with a maximum wall length of 6 m or less, which is oriented to the **rear lot line**, or **side lot line**, not **abutting** a public road the minimum **setback** from the **rear lot line**, and **side lot line**, not **abutting** a public road is 1.2 m; and

ii) for detached **accessory buildings** with a maximum wall length greater than 6 m, which is oriented to the **rear lot line**, or **side lot line**, not **abutting** a public road the minimum **setback** from the **rear lot line**, **rear** and **side lot line**, not **abutting** a public road is 2.4 m.”

6. The following is inserted as Section 4.7.11:

“4.7.11 No attached **garage** can project more than 9.1 m from the front wall of a **single detached dwelling**.”

7. Part 6 – Landscaping and Screening is amended by inserting the following as a new Section 6.2.9:

“6.2.9 For a **lot** fronting onto a local **arterial road** or a major **arterial road**, a solid masonry or brick **fence** up to a maximum **fence height** of 1.2 m is permitted within the required **front yard setback** area, but any mechanical or manual gate must be located at least 6.0 m from the front **lot line**.”

8. Part 6 – Landscaping and Screening is amended by deleting Section 6.4 in its entirety and replacing it with the following:

**“6.4. Landscape Requirements in Residential Zones**

6.4.1. In the **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that govern **single detached housing**, the **owner** of the property is responsible for the placement and proper maintenance of **landscaping**, in the **front yard** as follows:

- a) for a **lot** with a **lot width** less than or equal to 15 m, live **landscaping** is to be provided covering a minimum of 50% of the required **front yard**;
- b) for a **lot** with a **lot width** greater than 15 m, live **landscaping** is to be provided covering a minimum of 55% of the required **front yard**; and
- c) for an irregular-shaped **lot**, the **City** shall determine the minimum area required for live **landscaping**, having regard to the area required for a paved driveway or walkway, to provide access to garage or house, and shall be located so as to maximize its functionality by ensuring its proper location in relation to **buildings**, sunlight, parking and other **site** factors.

6.4.2. The **owner** shall plant and maintain within 3.0 m of the **front lot line** one new or replacement tree of a minimum size of 6.0 cm on every **lot** that is:

- a) regulated by the **residential zones** or **site specific zones** that govern **single detached housing subdivisions**;
- b) on a **lot** that is being **subdivided** into two or more **lots** on a single **subdivision** plan.

6.4.3. In the case of a **corner lot**, an additional new or replacement tree shall be planted within 3.0 m of the **side lot line** which **abuts** a **road**.

6.4.4 On a **lot** that is subject to a building permit application for **single detached housing** which contains no existing trees at the time of building permit application, a minimum of two (2) trees – one (1) in the required **front yard** and one (1) in the required **rear yard**– must be planted as part of a building permit.

- 6.4.5. In the **residential zones** and **site specific zones** that govern residential **uses**, the **owner** of the property is responsible for the placement and proper maintenance of **landscaping, screening and fences** on the **site** for all **yards** visible from a **road**. The **owner** of the property shall also ensure that the portion of the **lot** not occupied by **non-porous surfaces**, including **buildings**, is planted and maintained with any combination of trees, shrubs, ornamental plants or lawn.
- 6.4.6. Private outdoor open space shall be located so as to maximize its functionality by ensuring its proper location in relation to **buildings**, sunlight, parking and other **site factors**.”
9. Section 8.1.5.3 is amended by inserting the following as a new subsection 8.1.5.3(d):
- “(d) any **side yard** area is excluded from the calculation of percentages of the **lot area** **which** is restricted to **landscaping** with live plant material.”
10. Section 8.1.6.6 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:
- “.6
- (a) for a **lot** with a **lot area** less than 372 m<sup>2</sup> and with a **lot depth** less than 28 m, the minimum **rear yard** is 6.0 m;
- (b) for a **lot** with a **lot area** greater than 372 m<sup>2</sup> and with a **lot depth** greater than 28 m, the minimum **rear yard** is the greater of 6.0 m or 25% of the total **lot depth**, up to a maximum of 10.7 m; or
- (c) For a **lot** containing a **single detached dwelling** of one storey only, the minimum **rear yard** is 6.0 m.”
11. Section 8.1.11 is amended by inserting the following as a new Section 8.1.11.1 and renumbering the remaining sections accordingly:
- “No **single detached housing dwelling unit** shall have an exterior wall oriented to an **interior side yard** with a maximum length of **continuous wall** greater than 55% of the total **lot depth**.”

12. This Bylaw may be cited as "Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaw 9524".

FIRST READING

\_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC HEARING

\_\_\_\_\_

SECOND READING

\_\_\_\_\_

THIRD READING

\_\_\_\_\_

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

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

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by <i>BJC</i>
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor <i>JA</i>