

# Survey responses

Period: 07 Jun 2010, 12:00 AM - 16 Aug 2016, 11:59 PM

Projects: Arterial Road Housing Policy Update

Arterial Road Policy Update Survey

**1**

**Respondent Name :** Michael1976

---

Responded at 22 Apr 2016, 02:18 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2.Comments:**

As long as it's done the long-term, as properties come up. I don't support tearing down of new homes (very wasteful) or large trees, owners being bullied into selling or infringing on current parkland. Also, as long as this stays this plan does not extend into single family home subdivisions.

## **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

## **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Absolutely - this is a must!

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

Too low minimum

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Too low minimum

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**  
No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**  
No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

For the most part

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

## [See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24. Comments:**

No response

### **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### **26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

## [See Board 12](#)

## [See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27. Comments:**

No response

### **28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

as I stated above, it's very important that this is done only as properties come up. I don't support tearing down of new homes (very wasteful) or large trees (already a problem that needs addressing), owners being bullied into selling or infringing on current parkland. Also, as long as this stays this plan does not extend into single family home subdivisions and does not take away the sun and privacy of single family homes they back onto.

### **29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4C2

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**2****Respondent Name :** Richmond Taxpayer

Responded at 22 Apr 2016, 03:12 PM

**1.****I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2. Comments:**

At one time Council ensured that neighbourhoods built in the 1960-70-early 80s, were a careful mix of bungalows, duplexes, back-splits, two level, etc. so that no part of Richmond became "ghettoized", and people, especially children in schools, had an equal opportunity to succeed. It was smart social engineering to raise citizens to the "highest common denominator" with less crime, mutual social support, real cultural integration and a strong sense of community. The detail of design was well thought out "houses could not even have windows opposite each other for privacy. Now we have three story towering structures, like guard towers on a prison, that obliterate any sense of privacy for a three or four home radius. Today we have lost that sense of community with a chaotic, mash-up of monster homes where no one lives, walls and gates along the street that block out the community, four foot high monstrosity lion statues on driveways that rival those on the Lions Gate bridge, and ugly finishes that do not blend into the neighbourhoods or reflect our west coast architecture. The failure of current construction policy has to stop. If we are to change these arterial roads, we have to first consider if it will improve the sense of community that is fast becoming lost. Will development put undue pressure on school enrolment? Will it impact increased costs in policing? Fire protection? EVERY person currently living on one of these arterial roads has to be mailed a survey to consider that the views of the people living there are heard, and the survey delivers real, CREDIBLE results. Not everyone reads the local paper, and who goes to the City web site to search for initiatives which may, or may not, affect them? Answer: no one. We have to provide meaningful, targeted contact. And if the first written survey mailed to them is not answered, we should consider hand delivery. Responses should be available both on-line or by mail. Let's provide HONEST REAL CONTACT with the those most affected, which could take 90 days, as opposed to "faking" a survey in two weeks for the convenience of politicians and bureaucrats. The citizens of richmond living in these areas will be able to tell the city what works best in their neighbourhood, and high on that list, ensure that their current sense of community is not destroyed with out of control development. IMMEDIATE attention should be given to extend this public consultation to 90 days or the results will have as little credibility as the provincial government regarding a Massey bridge.

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

ABSOLUTELY NOT. The environment, and green space around homes is FAR more important than jamming the largest home possible on a small lot and then pouring concrete all around it.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

If a house is to be demolished, then the new home MUST conform to the same setbacks.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

If a house is to be demolished, then the new home MUST conform to the same setbacks.

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16. Comments:**

ABSOLUTELY NOT.

### **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

NO NO NO

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

NO NO NO

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27. Comments:**

No response



**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This "survey" holds as much water add a sieve. The time allotment for this survey is ridiculously short, and formulated to frustrate public input. Right now it has zero credibility.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5K8

**32. My Name is:**

JJ West a.k.a. Unhappy Richmond Taxpayer

**33. My e-mail address is:**

link2west@gmail.com

### 3

**Respondent Name :** jansago

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 07:21 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7a4n3

**32. My Name is:**

Amy

**33. My e-mail address is:**

amykford@telus.net

## 4

**Respondent Name :** lancing

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 07:34 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

The City is over building.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

The City is over building.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

The City is over building.

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

The City is over building.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

The City is over building.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

The City is over building.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

The City is over building.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

What roads are these people going to live on? For example No.2 Road. Do you know how busy No.2



Road is currently or how about No.3 Road?

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The City doesn't care about their residents. This survey is just protocol. This is what the city plans to do and telling us what they are going to do in this survey. I guess the planners, council, staff will be happy when all the greenery is all cement. I am not happy with the density and the dense decisions that are being made at City Hall.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C3A9

**32. My Name is:**

kerry starchuk

**33. My e-mail address is:**

kerry starchuk@hotmail.com

**5**

**Respondent Name :** Rupert Whiting

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 07:49 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single**

**family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E5W2

**32. My Name is:**

Rupert Whiting

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Rupertwhiting@gmail.com

## 6

**Respondent Name :** licorise

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 08:20 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

This is a good way to support growth. I do not like or support the way some lots have been

subdivided into two, having a driveway in between, these homes are just boxes with cement around them, no landscaping or greenery. I think developers should be encouraged to do land assemblies and put proper lanes behind, or just townhouse. I live on a street that will be affected, and have always thought it would work well here.

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

As long as the exit is not too close to an intersection as in the one at Steve Easton and Gilbert. That entrance/exit is too close to the corner.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27.Comments:**

No response



**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

It's a lot to take in, I will have to attend the meeting, there are lots of changes and the city should take their time to make sure this is the correct way to go.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e3z9

**32. My Name is:**

Penny Charlebois

**33. My e-mail address is:**

pennycharlebois@telus.net

**7**

**Respondent Name :** priceless

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 08:22 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

FOR SURE!!

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6M5

**32. My Name is:**

Sharon

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sprice409@hotmail.com

**8**

**Respondent Name :** Norma Desmond

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 08:41 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

There is too much high density housing in Richmond already!!!! Traffic is getting terrible. Surely the City cannot be so greedy that they would sacrifice the livability of this city in exchange for more tax

revenues. Before long, Richmond will just be another unpleasant, overcrowded suburb, and people will be leaving, not moving here.

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **5.Comments:**

There is too much high density housing in Richmond already!!!! Traffic is getting terrible. Surely the City cannot be so greedy that they would sacrifice the livability of this city in exchange for more tax revenues. Before long, Richmond will just be another unpleasant, overcrowded suburb, and people will be leaving, not moving here.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **7.Comments:**

This is a devious question, and you have not explained its meaning properly. What do you mean by "more flexibility"??? How do you expect the average person to answer this question???? Get real, you need to tell us the FACTS about what you are proposing, not bamboozle us with bafflegab!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 9. Comments:

But what are they limited to now? Are townhouses allowed to back onto single family lots? More lack of clarity. I suspect an attempt to obfuscate your intent.

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 11. Comments:

But what are they limited to now? Are townhouses allowed to back onto single family lots? More lack of clarity. I suspect an attempt to obfuscate your intent.

**12.  
The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 13. Comments:

I repeat my comments from the first question. If you consider the state of compact residential housing in other suburbs, the main thing you notice is that nobody has anywhere to park!!! They park on the street. Do you really want that along the arterial roads? or anywhere?

## 14. Lane Network

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 16. Comments:

I DO NOT SUPPORT COMPACT LOTS AT ALL.

## 17.Arterial Road Compact Lots

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 19.Comments:

I DO NOT SUPPORT COMPACT LOTS AT ALL. Richmond is crowded enough!

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 21.Comments:

I do not support compact lots. Surely the City cannot be so greedy that they would sacrifice the livability of this city in exchange for more tax revenues. Before long, Richmond will just be another unpleasant, overcrowded suburb, and people will be leaving, not moving here.

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 24.Comments:

No response



## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 27.Comments:

I do not support arterial road duplexes, triplexes, or anything else that would increase density in Richmond. Surely the City cannot be so greedy that they would sacrifice the livability of this city in exchange for more tax revenues. Before long, Richmond will just be another unpleasant, overcrowded suburb, and people will be leaving, not moving here.

## 28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

## 29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

No response

## 31.My postal code is (required):

V7B1H4

## 32.My Name is:

Sandra Jensen

## 33.My e-mail address is:

normadesmondjensen@gmail.com

**9**

**Respondent Name :** varju

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 08:54 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Houses should not get closer than they already are. Back yards are important, and a large house next door lowers the value of my yard.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

Loss of green space seems unnecessary. One entrance to a property should be sufficient.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

## Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**  
No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**  
No response

## **22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**  
No response

## **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the**

proposed requirements >

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I don't understand this push for densification. More people do not benefit the city. It means more traffic, larger buildings, smaller yards, more noise.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e 1m5

**32. My Name is:**

Alex Varju

**33. My e-mail address is:**

alex@varju.ca

**10**

**Respondent Name :** Richard

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 09:03 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated**

## development requirements

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 19. Comments:

No response

## 20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 21. Comments:

No response

## 22. Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## 23.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24. Comments:

No response

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 3V2

**32. My Name is:**

Richard L. Young

**33. My e-mail address is:**

canadayoungs@hotmail.com

**11**

**Respondent Name :** Lorne Brandt

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 09:32 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2.Comments:**

However, I don't think current good homes should be torn down to make room for this as is now happening. Not everyone needs to move to live in Richmond and if there are no homes or lots available they can move elsewhere just as so many are being forced to move elsewhere who do live here because of rising costs.

## **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5.Comments:**

I do wish the guidelines specified larger shade trees though, front and back. We need them for cooling, moisturizing, absorbing CO2 and making O2. It helps combat global warming in so many ways. What does a 6 cm caliber tree mean - only 3" in diam??? That's a shrub. Trees that are removed need to be replaced by trees of equal size somewhere on the lot.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9. Comments:**

What about restrictions on paving/bricking front lots?

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **11. Comments:**

Access to minor and main arterial roads needs to be limited/controlled (?) as traffic is increasing on them and too many points of access frustrates those trying to enter.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **13. Comments:**

No response

#### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16. Comments:**

No response

#### **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the**

**proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 1N5

**32. My Name is:**

Lorne Brandt

**33. My e-mail address is:**

brandte1@telus.net

**12**

**Respondent Name :** Neil Collins

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 09:47 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No



- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 1M5

**32. My Name is:**

Neil Collins

**33. My e-mail address is:**

nccollins@gmail.com

## 13

**Respondent Name :** ShellmontOne

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 09:50 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

A qualified yes. The problem with the proposed policy is that it encourages too many access points (driveways) along major arterial roads. With increased housing density the same roadway will have to accommodate a lot more vehicles promoting traffic congestion (traffic volume will exceed roadway capacity). Adding in more high use access points will slow down arterial traffic flow, frustrate drivers, and increase opportunities for accidents.

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

When abutting a detached single family home the wording for height should not say "two stories" but should say "maximum of two stories" and no higher than the neighbouring house. What is the purpose of the 1.5 m first floor projection into the setback space? Makes the setback requirement a joke.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

Wording in the proposed policy should reflect the question e.g., "limited to ...". See Board 6 and earlier comments.

### **10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

#### **[See Board 6](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

And first story as well.

### **12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

#### **[See Board 6](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

Should be 6.0 m.

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

### **15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16. Comments:**

The day-lighting lane should always be connected to a local road, not an arterial road. If traffic volume is high enough there may be a need to install a traffic light where the local road and arterial

road intersect. The cost of the traffic signal should be included in the cost recovery proposal associated with the building of the day-lighting lane.

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A3H6

**32. My Name is:**

ShellmontOne

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**14**

**Respondent Name :** Blobarhallon

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:06 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

More densification means more investment into parks, schools and facilitates. Richmond needs to use its geographic proximity to Vancouver to its advantage and grow according to population demands.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

No response

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

No response

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 2P6

**32. My Name is:**

K. Johansson

**33. My e-mail address is:**

knchangfoot@gmail.com

**15**

**Respondent Name :** Annemette

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:12 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

The density of Richmond is ridiculous as it is. Our infrastructure cannot support any more high rises. The mess that is being built near the Oval is a testament to how poorly managed the addition of new high rises is, and the traffic there is now a nightmare. And since the buildings aren't finished yet, they are not yet occupied, and thus haven't even started the additional traffic!

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

### **4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

No response

### **6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

No response

### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **9. Comments:**

No more tall buildings or high rises!

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **13. Comments:**

People need driveways to park their cars, as there's not enough room on the roads. And there's virtually no room for visitors to park.

## **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **16. Comments:**

No lanes if it means many more laneway houses. Looking at the map, one can see that Richmond is dense enough as it is!

## **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

Richmond is already too densely built and populated!

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the**

## proposed requirements >

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I find that this survey is purposefully confusing and poorly worded. Also, the City's policies are not being broadcasted and publicized well enough to give its' residents a chance to know what's going on and have a say. On another note, I wish there was a law that forbade any abode to sit vacant for more than 3 months. If people own a home, they should live in it or rent it out. As it is 2nd generation Richmond citizens cannot afford to rent or buy a home here, and they move an hour or more outside of the city. Making the city only affordable to financially established buyers, who may be too old to supply the schools with the children they need. Hence schools are closing, and the population of the city ends up being aging and dependent on support from a generation that isn't here.

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

### 31. My postal code is (required):

V7B 1G6

### 32. My Name is:

Annemette Jerning

### 33. My e-mail address is:

annemette\_jerning@hotmail.com

# 16

Respondent Name : cdyck76

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:30 AM

1.

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes



**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5K6

**32. My Name is:**

Chris Dyck

**33. My e-mail address is:**

cdyck76@gmail.com

**17**

**Respondent Name :** Talona

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:38 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

The increase in density should be graduated, respecting adjacent properties, so that changes are not abrupt. Increases in noise, activity, and traffic need to be moderate, especially when ongoing changes are added in. A significant loss of sight lines is unacceptable. Setbacks from the street need to be increased. If single family zoning is changed to multi-family, then nearby single family needs to be re-zoned to duplex, and so on.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

We need more design variety, such as west coast style intermixed with craftsman and other styles. Greater setback off roads is very important.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **19.Comments:**

Worried about adding too much density to infrastructure.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **21.Comments:**

Too claustrophobic

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 27.Comments:

Triplexes are just too tight - looks like a fire hazard. A slum like appearance may evolve.

## 28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

## 29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

## 31.My postal code is (required):

V7e 6g7

## 32.My Name is:

Terence Friesen

## 33.My e-mail address is:

Terryfriesen@shaw.ca

# 18

Respondent Name : eejmw

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:47 AM

1.

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes



**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X2G9

**32. My Name is:**

Michael Wong

**33. My e-mail address is:**

jm9534@yahoo.com

**19**

**Respondent Name :** Villager

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 10:50 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated**

## development requirements

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 19. Comments:

No response

## 20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 21. Comments:

No response

## 22. Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## 23.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24. Comments:

No response

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

These policies promote and encourage a further decline in the liveability and hometown atmosphere of Richmond to what Richmond is fast becoming (or already is) : an impersonal, overcrowded, desolate centre of neighbourhoods being transformed into urbanhoods.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 3K3

**32. My Name is:**

Peter Smith

**33. My e-mail address is:**

writewellsoon@gmail.com

**20**

**Respondent Name :** kathyc

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 11:39 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I believe the city is expanding housing at a rate services are not keeping up with. Until the appropriate amount of money is put in to libraries (not reducing hours and book collections!), community centres, pools, and arena, additional densification should not be allowed.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

The vast majority of internal lots are less than 115' deep, which allows townhouses to be built further into just about every neighbourhood than just the arterial road, according to the provision on Board 5. This is a slippery slope. Also, current townhouse design accommodates maximum housing, not any sense of community.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single**

## family lots

### [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

### [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

### [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **13.Comments:**

No response

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### [Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

## Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the**



## proposed requirements >

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I think we need to be focusing on overall community development, not just housing. Richmond is in grave danger of losing its reputation as a shining example of community services, recreation, and libraries to become nothing but a sea of high density housing. The more we can make Richmond a walkable city with neighbourhood services, shopping, etc., the better our future quality of life will be. Simply adding greater housing density is far from being the answer.

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

### 31. My postal code is (required):

v6y3c6

### 32. My Name is:

Kathy

### 33. My e-mail address is:

kathysemail@shaw.ca

**Respondent Name :** Maria

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 01:19 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

No response

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e1m5

**32. My Name is:**

Maria Varju

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Maria@varju.ca

**22**

**Respondent Name :** FORTUNATO

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 01:40 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

I am totally against row housing; row housing devalues all our homes.

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Enough with all this needless building in Richmond; more buildings means more need for emergency



services and I doubt if that can be accomplished in Richmond. We are overpopulated now so what happens when and if we have a major crisis like an earthquake. Stop this building frenzy now.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y3V4

**32. My Name is:**

Patrick J. Caccamo

**33. My e-mail address is:**

camo302@telus.net

## 23

**Respondent Name :** Pippin

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 01:42 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Richmond is losing all its "green" areas. High density housing uses up all the land, covers it with nothing but concrete. The city services, community centres etc. are already at over capacity - how would the City accommodate all the additional people?

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9.Comments:**

No townhouse should be higher than the houses on single family lots. We already have houses being built that exceed the "norm" in many neighbourhoods and they look extremely ugly and out of place.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Richmond is becoming a concrete jungle. Slow down!!!!!!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4Z2

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**24**

**Respondent Name :** cchan

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 02:18 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;



- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X3J8

**32. My Name is:**

Carmen

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**25**

**Respondent Name : k**

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 03:06 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

already toooooooooooooooooooooo con jested

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v6y 2t8

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 26

**Respondent Name :** dpcjradio

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 03:30 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Road infrastructure in Richmond can not support increased density and the ensuing increase in vehicles. We need wider, faster, and more roads, not more buildings.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

It is too difficult to access this survey and indeed the City of Richmond site. Impossible for the non technical and the elderly.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter



- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7B 1H4

**32. My Name is:**

David Jensen

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**27**

**Respondent Name :** EDC

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 03:57 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

I think it should actually be more than 4.5 m. Probably 6m so it doesn't interfere with the neighbour's enjoyment of their property by blocking out sunlight.

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### 24. Comments:

No response

### 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I will try to attend the open house at West Richmond Community Centre.

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C4C3

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 28

**Respondent Name :** lefty321

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 04:58 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I'm finding the arterial roads too densified. There is too much street parking and making it very difficult to drive around; especially on the weekends; if there was ever an emergency these streets would be a disaster

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E1H8

**32. My Name is:**



No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 29

**Respondent Name :** Schooner

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 05:10 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I hesitate in respect of Railway Ave. south. Otherwise agreeable subject to the underlying prescription for densification itself - to which I am hostile.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

#### **7. Comments:**

No response

#### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9. Comments:**

Positively - no exceptions, no funny business. 2 storeys of standard height, period.

#### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **11. Comments:**

No response

#### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **13. Comments:**

The minimum rear setback next to SF lots should be 6M. Fencing may somewhat alleviate the loss of privacy for adjoining SF lots threatened by the 1.5M ground floor exception, but deprives the MF unit of reasonable yard space for children, pets, gardens, patios. I accept mere "pocket yards" in, say, co-ops or elder housing, offset by common greens - but we are approaching mere allusion to "backyards" as we break the 6M standard, incompatible with realistic family life, tree bylaws, pet ownership, and private recreation. I would support sacrificing front yard setbacks to accommodate extended back yard setbacks.

#### **14. Lane Network**

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

Lanes expose back-to-back houses to burglary risk. If lanes are the answer to vehicular access (and I'll take your professional word for it), there ought to be tolerance for compensatory security measures e.g. increased fence height. I nevertheless prefer the aesthetics and lifestyle implications of vehicular lane-access over garage-fronted recent builds.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

Question too broad.

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Westwind subdivision ("inside circumference units") is unreasonably threatened by Railway south planning. At the very least I suggest you reconsider limiting Railway densification south of Steveston Hwy to Single-family fee-simple units.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

If you're wondering "where is this guy coming from" the answer is simple: 1. I don't want my sunrise/sunset blocked out by 3.5 storey wall-to-wall monstrosities. 2. I don't want songbirds extinguished by the practical impossibility of permitting broadleaf trees of appreciable canopy in densified areas. 2. I don't want the consequences of densification to include demographic degradation. My kids play in one of the few needle-free parks in the GVRD, please don't concede it to whatever has gone hideously wrong everywhere else. 3. I view the integration of Steveston into a densified Richmond with apprehension.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E4L1

**32.My Name is:**

Tom Miller

**33.My e-mail address is:**

tom.miller@lonza.com

## 30

**Respondent Name :** Saffron

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 05:43 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

No response

## 24.Comments:

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 27.Comments:

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4P7



**32.My Name is:**

Margaret Graham

**33.My e-mail address is:**

mcgraham@shaw.ca

# 31

**Respondent Name :** Anne39liese

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 07:45 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

**[See Board 5](#)**

**[See Board 6](#)**

**[See Board 13](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

**[See Board 5](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I do not support building any more expensive mega homes in Richmond. Richmond needs to build more affordable housing for young families and seniors. I would like to see a law that prohibits foreign ownership of property.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5P5

**32. My Name is:**

Anneliese Frauendorf

### 33. My e-mail address is:

abf111139@yahoo.ca

## 32

**Respondent Name :** kathbeau

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 09:51 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I think we need to be specific about which arterial roads are being considered.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

I have a problem with the tree retention statement as it is misleading and raises expectations. Each time I have raised concerns about tree removal on a building site I have been told that in Richmond it is all most impossible to retain trees because typically lots have to be filled and when this happens the tree roots can not sustain the additional weight on their roots and become buried too deeply. The other reason I'm given is the roots will be damaged by new foundations. I think there are very few opportunities for retention on building lots particularly high density lots so why not be up front about it and mitigate the on going disappointment that we continue to experience every time there is a new build on an arterial road.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Absolutely this the best point in this whole proposal!

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

I agree with the second story set back but I don't agree with the 4.5 yard set back. I'd rather see the yard at 6 meters as well as the second floor. People and children need yards to play in. They need to be able to open a patio door in the summer with out encroaching on the private space of the single family home behind them. I sold a home because of the town houses that were built behind me. town houses we're too close, and noisy.

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

At least 6 m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**Board 8**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**See Board 10**

**See Board 11**

**See Board 14**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**See Board 11**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6V5



**32. My Name is:**

Kathleen Beaumont

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Beaumont.kath@gmail.com

## 33

**Respondent Name :** JenP

---

Responded at 23 Apr 2016, 11:30 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I would support more densification than shown.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

I would support more densification than shown.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated**

## **townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

### **[See Board 5](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7. Comments:**

No response

#### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

### **[See Board 6](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **9. Comments:**

No response

#### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

### **[See Board 6](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **11. Comments:**

No response

#### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

### **[See Board 6](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **13. Comments:**

No response

#### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

#### **15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Increasing density is a good thing. Consider allowing carriage houses, etc. on more lots.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 3S5

**32. My Name is:**

Jennifer Pelletier

**33. My e-mail address is:**

jen.pelletier@gmail.com

## 34

**Respondent Name :** ROIDON

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 08:19 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

In the last few years we have or on the road to completing 22 resident towers in Richmond with a massive increase in population and yet some of our infrastructure has in no way grown. The Richmond Hospital has definitely not kept pace with the increase in population with current wait times in "emerg" sometimes over 3 hours. Health care should be a cornerstone of any community and ours is suffering tremendously from neglect in size and its ability to cope with the number of people using it, heaven help us when all the new apt. towers are full of people and now you want to cram more in with more densification.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E4Y7

**32. My Name is:**

R.A. Lamb



**33. My e-mail address is:**

roidons@telus.net

## 35

**Respondent Name :** HaydnR

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 09:36 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Most is fine but would prefer min 6m rear set back without additional 1.5m ground floor projection

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

It should be at least 6m

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Duplexes yes Triplex no

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v6y 2x4

**32. My Name is:**

Haydn Richardson

**33. My e-mail address is:**

## 36

**Respondent Name :** CJ

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 01:23 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Densification is a good thing for our carbon footprint. It's great that we are trying to provide a variety of housing options to residents.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

No response

### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

I see no reason to limit height of townhouses to only 2 storeys beside single family lots. Three storey townhouses will provide more density - thus lower carbon footprint - and eventually we will be moving away from single family lots any way.

### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

It's good to have space around houses where possible for kids to play plus isolate buildings from fire.

### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

No response

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

### **15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X3G3

**32. My Name is:**

CaroLyn Jimenez

**33. My e-mail address is:**



# 37

**Respondent Name :** Doug Johnson

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 02:02 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My opinion of the current and future designs of dwellings are a blight on Richmond. The idea of row housing smacks of organized tenements. Seeing house after house with the same floor plan regardless of the exterior cosmetic detail is an insult to the senses and speaks to the cheap construction and high selling price. At the moment I am being surrounded by vacant houses that don't add to the social and economic wellbeing of the community. Along with the lost promise of 'no impact to traffic' I am seeing a degeneration of police enforcing the laws. This can only get worse. So I have to say 'NO' to the social experiment to densify Richmond for the raising of the city treasury to fund misguided projects.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4X7

**32. My Name is:**

Doug Johnson

### 33. My e-mail address is:

tiffin@shaw.ca

## 38

**Respondent Name :** Sparky

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 05:26 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Traffic issues with access to arterials.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Needs more work. Traffic still an issue. Setbacks and heights are an issue when butted up against existing houses.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **7. Comments:**

Not in the interests of the current homes on the block.

#### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9. Comments:**

The height and setback should match the lots they are backing onto.

#### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **11. Comments:**

No response

#### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **13. Comments:**

6 metres

#### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

#### **15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

Lanes must not be along fence lines unless the lanes are already existing.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7c 3k9

**32. My Name is:**

No response



### 33. My e-mail address is:

No response

## 39

**Respondent Name :** TEA Party

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 06:45 PM

1.

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 2. Comments:

Do we really need more vacant residential units? A friend back east tells me there is not one legitimate dollar coming to BC. from China. I guess this is why the houses sit empty.

### 3. Arterial Road Townhouses

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 5. Comments:

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes

- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **27.Comments:**

No response

## **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

## **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

## **31.My postal code is (required):**

726

## **32.My Name is:**

Gary

## **33.My e-mail address is:**

g5winkelman@shaw.ca

# 40

**Respondent Name :** ultimace

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 08:11 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

No response

**2.Comments:**

I think the townhouse or densified housing should be built inside the block because the arterial roads are already too crowd. If the entrance is on arterial roads, it will be no way to drive and slow down the traffic

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

Need graphic to support

**8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Board 6 is better and make the lot bigger for townhouse and not too tall.

**10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

should be more than 6 meter

**12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

should be more than 4.5m

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

should be no lane to arterial road

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

No response

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X3X4

**32. My Name is:**

K. Lo

**33. My e-mail address is:**

acemkl@hotmail.com



**Respondent Name :** WinnieAppleChen

---

Responded at 24 Apr 2016, 11:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2T4

**32. My Name is:**

Winnie

**33. My e-mail address is:**

wjwinnie@gmail.com

**42**

**Respondent Name :** NatalieK

---

Responded at 25 Apr 2016, 10:18 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I don't see a problem with this along arterial roads as I have quite liked the designs of recent townhouse developments. I would much rather see the growing number of beautiful townhouses instead of monster homes. BUT I am still against knocking down homes that are < 20 years old and I think it's important to not put up too many townhouse complexes.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

"Newer homes" (or to be, any home less than 20 years old) should not be knocked down to build townhouses.

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Absolutely agree.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

Absolutely agree that this should be a minimum.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

I have no problem with it. But I particularly like that only one will be considered per block and

definitely need it to be well lit.

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

I would much rather have these than big monster homes with gates around them (which I think should be more limited).

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

I would strongly support having coach units built above garages.

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **27.Comments:**

Yes I agree with having any of these three options. Although this may not be completely relevant, I do have a problem with the photo in Board12 for a "Typical Single Family Dwelling on Arterial Road". To me, this house should not be "typical". It is all concrete and there is no yard.

## **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I support the concept of having townhouses, duplexes, and triplexes built on arterial roads. And if this requires laneways, I do not see a problem. As I have mentioned repeatedly, I think this city has a really big problem with massive homes being built with concrete-only front yards and large gates. It removes any sense of community that we have left and the removal of grass and greenery is really unfortunate.

## **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

## **31.My postal code is (required):**

v7e4w9



**32.My Name is:**

Natalie

**33.My e-mail address is:**

nkorenic@hotmail.ca

## 43

**Respondent Name :** zookeeper

---

Responded at 25 Apr 2016, 12:07 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2T3

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**44**

**Respondent Name :** kneuman

---

Responded at 25 Apr 2016, 04:38 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No

- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C1Y1

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

k\_neuman@telus.net

**45**

**Respondent Name :** madison1

---

Responded at 25 Apr 2016, 07:15 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

only with lanes and reasonable setbacks from road

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**



**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

it is only reasonable if there is single family backing on the project

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

6 meters

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within

- the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
  - **A Richmond resident;**
  - A Richmond builder/developer;
  - Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 1M2

**32. My Name is:**

Greg

**33. My e-mail address is:**

halsey@shaw.ca

## 46

**Respondent Name :** Mike

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 12:13 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

As an absolute maximum.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Could be increased to 5.0m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E5M4

**32. My Name is:**

Mike Charlton

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mcharlton@sd38.bc.ca

## 47

**Respondent Name :** Bhowlett

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 05:05 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

**[See Board 5](#)**

**[See Board 6](#)**

**[See Board 13](#)**



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

should be at least 10 m

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

should be at least 8 m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C2W9

**32. My Name is:**

Bob Howlett

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bhowlett5611@gmail.com

## 48

**Respondent Name :** ehowlett

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 05:11 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

would like at least 10 m

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

would like at least 8 m

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

#### **See Board 10**

#### **See Board 11**

#### **See Board 14**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

#### **See Board 11**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

#### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2W9

**32. My Name is:**

Ellen Howlett

**33. My e-mail address is:**

ehowlett5611@gmail.com

## 49

**Respondent Name :** AvianFLU

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 05:51 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

There has been an increased number of parked cars on the arterial roads which have severely limited traffic and caused additional congestion within the city.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**



No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7a3s5

**32. My Name is:**

Adrian Yu

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sushiboy18@gmail.com

# 50

Respondent Name : Michelleli

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 07:16 PM

1.

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I am only interested in this issue as far as providing more affordable housing in Richmond, which is sorely lacking. More than all these measurements, set backs, and policies, I want to see a maximum on these house prices. I want to see affordable housing so my friends, family, children can continue to live in Richmond in the future. Please make this a bigger consideration than set backs, locations, etc. I don't want developers excessively lining their pockets on property developments, we need to take care of the working people in Richmond. Maximums on laneway and high density housing is needed immediately. We don't need more housing, we need more affordable housing.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4S5

**32. My Name is:**

Michelle Li

**33. My e-mail address is:**

michelleli.van@gmail.com

# 51

**Respondent Name :** smeixner

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 09:15 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response



**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2K7

**32. My Name is:**

Scott Meixner

**33. My e-mail address is:**

smeixner@telus.net

**52**

**Respondent Name :** Gourmet

---

Responded at 26 Apr 2016, 10:31 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

Higher buildings allow for more density, which is smarter for growth.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

No response

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16. Comments:**

No response

### **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Z 3A3

**32. My Name is:**

Jason August

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Atjc8@yahoo.com

**53**

**Respondent Name :** Pandabeaver

---

Responded at 27 Apr 2016, 04:20 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to**

**accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

The city does not need more congestion. It's already bad enough that people who have lived here for almost all of their lives are forced to move out, due to the excessive noise from neighbors who do not care about city noise bylaws among other issues. Prior to a mix of Strata fining residents who continue to break the bylaws, non-emergency RCMP was being called 2-3 times a week for 2 years to get one resident to quiet down, eventually giving them a fine. Now multiple this by three. That's just here in the McNeely block. My friends who have lived here for a long time also get noise problems from various Chinese residents around the city and have been dealing with them for a long time. The larger the population, the greater the consequence of crime and accidents happening. Just because Richmond has land, it doesn't mean it needs to be developed for more housing. The government want to close down schools, cause more stress for teachers with larger classes and bring in more foreigners without protecting Canadian citizens. Why? Because all you care about are your own pockets, disguised by saying it's to fund the city's features and functions.

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

## **4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

## **6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion



## 7. Comments:

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 9. Comments:

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

10.

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 11. Comments:

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

12.

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 13. Comments:

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

### **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

We don't need more people. We need existing Canadians to continue to be able to live here. This is turning into Hong Kong. Eventually townhouses will be so thin, that you can fit 10 families into one lot that was originally built for one house.

### **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);

- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V6V2S4

**32.My Name is:**

Leeman Cheng

**33.My e-mail address is:**

leeman.cheng@yahoo.ca

## 54

**Respondent Name :** mmemarin

---

Responded at 27 Apr 2016, 06:58 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated**

## development requirements and design guidelines

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 5. Comments:

No response

### 6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 7. Comments:

No response

### 8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 9. Comments:

No response

### 10.

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 11. Comments:

No response

### 12.

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be**

at least 4.5 m

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 1J7

**32.My Name is:**

Christine Marin

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mmemarin@gmail.com

**55**

**Respondent Name :** LaineyD18

---

Responded at 27 Apr 2016, 09:31 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Richmond is becoming so dense that it is losing its desirability. It's also causing road traffic congestion.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No opinion on location. Yes to guidelines and requirements.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**



[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

A definite yes. Single family homes should not suffer with the planned densification. Especially, not compromise their privacy, peace, and quiet.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**  
No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**  
No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**  
No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C2M7

**32. My Name is:**

No response

### 33. My e-mail address is:

No response

## 56

**Respondent Name :** wdw

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 10:33 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **2. Comments:**

Too many townhomes. The beauty of Richmond will be jeopardised with rows of townhomes along the sides of all the main routes. It will make Richmond appear cluttered and crowded.

### **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **5. Comments:**

Too many townhomes. Reduce the height to only two stories, but do not reduce the set back measurements.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Maintain the 6 m set back.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**See Board 10**

**See Board 11**

**See Board 14**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**See Board 11**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

I have no problem with the associated requirements, but there are just too row developments in general.

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**See Board 11**

**See Board 14**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4W6

**32. My Name is:**

Warwick

### 33. My e-mail address is:

wdwright@telus.net

## 57

**Respondent Name :** RGoodchild

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 11:55 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

While I am generally in favour of the changes and increased density, there are some potential problems with the parking and traffic around these sites. Often there is limited onsite parking in townhouse developments and also parking restrictions on the arterial roads. The parking restrictions are important for traffic flow but when the residents park on the street and ignore the regulations, traffic impacts result. This can cause traffic delays, unsafe lane changes and unsafe pedestrian crossing. Traffic on Number 1 Rd. is an example where there are parking restrictions on most of the road but some parking still occurs when the road is heavily used such as on Saturdays or when a soccer event is held at Hugh Boyd Park. The existing traffic then converges on the one remaining lane and this impedes traffic in the local business area. Bus service on many of the arterial roads is currently nonexistent so that does not promote transit as an alternative to cars.



**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

This should probably be increased to a greater distance.

**14. Lane Network**

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

When the lane entrance is close to an intersection of two arterial roads it can cause a traffic hazard. For example, on Williams Road west of No 1 Rd. there is a lane entrance for the houses south of Williams Road. When vehicles heading west on Williams turn left to enter the laneway, this can block traffic including cars turning from No 1 Rd. to head west on Williams Road. I am not sure if any accidents have occurred as a result but the traffic on No 1 Rd. can be heavy at times and having a left turning vehicle only a few feet from the intersection is hard for drivers to anticipate.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth

- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 1H9

**32. My Name is:**

Ruth Goodchild

**33. My e-mail address is:**

rgoodchild@uniserve.com

## 58

**Respondent Name :** CC

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 03:07 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

We need to get serious about densification and 2 storeys is wholly inadequate if the 'fear' is purely due to abutting a single family home. Single family homes need not be fully protected like this holy grail of the highest taxpayer!

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

## 14.Lane Network

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## 17.Arterial Road Compact Lots

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### [See Board 10](#)

### [See Board 11](#)

### [See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### [See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- **Twitter**
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C0A6

**32. My Name is:**

Corey C

**33. My e-mail address is:**

corey.colville@gmail.com

## 59

**Respondent Name :** VMW

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 05:31 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

New housing types are essential to permit the enhanced affordability of housing in Richmond. The current zoning requirements limits these options. As a result, there is an overabundance of "omega-homes" as lot sizes and prices dictate/favour this option. We need a range of options appropriate to the area. Sadly watching our young people leave the community.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**



See earlier comment. We need a range of options that are appropriate for the various circumstances.

**6.  
I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

See above comment

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

See above comments.

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.  
The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This initiative is overdue. I have been speaking to many friends and neighbours regarding this need for a number of years. There are excellent examples of smaller lots, duplexes/triplexes and townhouse. We simply need more of them. These have worked well and allow for housing appropriate for those who live and work locally. I commend the City of Richmond for being proactive and encourage you to move forward as soon as possible. The longer the delay, the greater the number of unaffordable (often "under inhabited" homes). Unfortunately the cost of the current "over-sized" single family lots leave this as the only commercially viable option. Let us do this for this generation of potential homeowners and community members. With appreciation.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E2B9

**32. My Name is:**

V. Wojna

**33. My e-mail address is:**

vmwojna@gmail.com

**60**

**Respondent Name :** Hikids

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 06:55 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Leave our suburbs alone, they need to stay single family areas

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

There is no parking in the current townhouse complexes

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e1z8

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Hikids@telus.net

# 61

**Respondent Name :** RMD Resident

---

Responded at 28 Apr 2016, 08:55 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

We really do not generally support the proposed new housing options contained in this report. Development of this type should be left to the general public and their developers. Not as a dictate of the City of Richmond. The work done by Richmond Townplanning on the report for this "LetsTalkRichmond" was very professional and well done but should be done at the request of Citizens of Richmond.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

See my Board 1 comments above: The map is excellent and easy to review and land assembly, side yard and height specifications quite acceptable and should be used on an individual specific



townhouse developments throughout Richmond.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

Yes as following my previous comments.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Good proposal

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

Depending on field conditions

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Not as a general rule. Should depend on field conditions.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

Again as above. Depends on field conditions and meeting roadway design type. (For "Minor Arterial Type" not applicable)

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

Acceptable concept for present development throughout Richmond

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Please note my opening comments.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

One additional consideration that should be studied for future development is inspection of all our Richmond Farms. Most are very unattractive and fallow. Some regulations should be imposed to insure that owners start growing something on their property or incur higher land taxes. Some Farm accusations by the City of these farmlands could be made to include many of the housing types in this report, "LetsTalkRichmond" to acquire further funding for the City

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;

- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2S1

**32.My Name is:**

Angus & Jan MacNeil

**33.My e-mail address is:**

amacneil@lightspeed.ca

## 62

**Respondent Name :** Joanne

---

Responded at 29 Apr 2016, 06:25 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

I have concern on how the the traffic system supports the growth in population. The traffic in city center area is very busy now. It will become a even bigger bottleneck for traffic going south to north, or vice versa.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7a 2k6

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**63**

**Respondent Name :** jtallosi

---

Responded at 29 Apr 2016, 12:20 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

**[See Board 5](#)**

**[See Board 6](#)**

**[See Board 13](#)**



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5. Comments:**

I would take it one step further though - these plans are focused on West Richmond, with no attention paid to the other side of the city. I think if these plans are to be city-wide, then the whole city should be part of the process.

#### **6. I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7. Comments:**

No response

#### **8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **9. Comments:**

No response

#### **10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **11. Comments:**

No response

#### **12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**

- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v6x1m1

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 64

**Respondent Name :** DBRichmond

---

Responded at 29 Apr 2016, 02:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4T1

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 65

**Respondent Name :** Heather McDonald

---

Responded at 29 Apr 2016, 07:34 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion



**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E4V9

**32. My Name is:**

Heather McDonald

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mcdonald.heather@shaw.ca

**Respondent Name :** eyt

---

Responded at 29 Apr 2016, 11:08 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

more townhouses allow all 3 storeys along main road limit to 2 storeys at rear and at least 6m rear yard setback

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

do not allow townhouses between new homes, keep the blocks with new homes for houses

**8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

and more setback, at least same as houses

**10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

the more the better

**12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

should be at least 6 m or same as houses

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No

- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 27.Comments:

should allow townhouses and not duplex/triplex on main roads take out driveways along bike lane, just like Williams Road between No. 4 and No. 5

## 28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

upgrade the main roads for better traffic - no parking, no driveways, more bike lanes build more townhouses and taller buildings along main roads, keep houses, duplex and triplex outside of main roads

## 29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

## 31.My postal code is (required):

v7e5y3

## 32.My Name is:

No response

## 33.My e-mail address is:

No response

## 67

**Respondent Name :** cooke family

---

Responded at 30 Apr 2016, 06:39 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response



**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

When off-hours parking on No. 1 Rd. was introduced, it was supposed to be temporary. This should now be cancelled due to the following changes: 1. Overall traffic has increased significantly. Terra Nova has been built out; Garry Point is no longer a sand dune, and Steveston is now a tourist destination. 2. Now that laneways behind densified properties have been significantly upgraded, additional parking on No. 1 Rd. is no longer needed. 3. On site sports parking has been added at Hugh Boyd Park. 4. Unlike other arterial roads (No. 2 Rd and No. 3 Rd), there are no left turn lanes on No. 1 Rd. between Steveston Hwy. and Westminster Hwy., so left turning cars automatically require lane changes for through traffic when cars are parked in the curb lanes. Occasional major special sports events at Boyd Park could be accommodated with "temporary parking" permits.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4H6

**32. My Name is:**

Chris Cooke

**33. My e-mail address is:**

cookecentral@shaw.ca

## 68

**Respondent Name :** Ryan

---

Responded at 30 Apr 2016, 10:06 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

It's good to develop lane network for compact lots. But as building lanes will take away land from developer/owner, incentives/compensations, such as higher desertification should be provided to facilitate the lane construction.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18. I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

## 24. Comments:

This row house development option should also be offered to those proposed lane development so that developers have the incentives to build the back lane.

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 27. Comments:

No response

## 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

## 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

## 31. My postal code is (required):

V7E 2L2

## 32. My Name is:

Ryan Wang

### 33. My e-mail address is:

ryanwgl@hotmail.com

## 69

**Respondent Name :** pacspro

---

Responded at 01 May 2016, 07:56 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

As much I I don't like this policy, I see it as one of the ways that young people may be able to afford a home here. More has to be done to investigate why real estate is skyrocketing and something needs to be seriously done to curb any corruption. If this isn't done, we will only have cities with wealthy citizens and no cross-section of ages causing an unhealthy and unbalanced demographic.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

No response

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 27. Comments:

No response

## 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

## 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

## 31. My postal code is (required):

V7C2N4

## 32. My Name is:

Sherry Sakamoto

## 33. My e-mail address is:

pacspro@shaw.ca

**Respondent Name : KS**

---

Responded at 01 May 2016, 11:23 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

but if you are to do this, build apartments, maybe 3-4 floor high, like in Europe, to really increase the density and lower the price.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

location ok, but I think you should build apartments, at least along No. 3 Road, 1 bus to Canada Line

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

can you build apartment on a small property?

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.  
The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

keep 6 m

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No

- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 27. Comments:

too many driveways, build townhouses and apartments, make Richmond looks more like a city than a suburb.

## 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

we have no character here, new houses look too big and ugly. townhouses look the same everywhere, can you build new buildings with same style in each neighbourhood? learn from European cities, high density with low rise buildings and great transit service.

## 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

## 31. My postal code is (required):

v7c5v3

## 32. My Name is:

No response

## 33. My e-mail address is:

# 71

**Respondent Name :** Mar

---

Responded at 01 May 2016, 12:13 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**



No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11.Comments:**

should be 10 m

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13.Comments:**

should be 8.5m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

## Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the**

proposed requirements >

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Making single family homes into duplexes, within neighbourhoods not on arterial roads, should be an option to allow families to stay together and afford to live in Richmond.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C4S4

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mdonaldso@gmail.com

**72**

**Respondent Name :** wcheng

---

Responded at 02 May 2016, 12:10 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The city should look into making for exceptions to allow more fee simple row houses, compact lot developments and front back duplexes on arterial (especially minor arterial) roads. This would help existing residents who own smaller single family lots with older homes to redevelop and increase living density on their properties, without needing to assemble the wider frontages usually needed for higher density townhouses. In addition if there is no lane access available for the initial development of a lot, the city should consider allowing temporary day lighting lanes to the back of the property until such time that a laneway connecting the back of several properties is developed.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v6x4l7

**32. My Name is:**

Winson

**33. My e-mail address is:**

wcheng604@gmail.com

**73**

**Respondent Name :** airman shaw

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

The city should be developed in a radius from City Hall. This would eliminate or lessen the cost of infrastructure. Developing along the lines of arterial roads is expensive, not well thought out and unsupportable without large expenditure.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

The city should be developed in a radius from City Hall. This would eliminate or lessen the cost of infrastructure. Developing along the lines of arterial roads is expensive, not well thought out and unsupportable without large expenditure. Leave the arterial roads to single family homes, or small business practices.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

The city should be developed in a radius from City Hall. This would eliminate or lessen the cost of infrastructure. Developing along the lines of arterial roads is expensive, not well thought out and unsupportable without large expenditure.



**8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

There should be no further townhouse development along the arterial roads. There is no place for children to play, high speed on the arterial road, with poor traffic control and poorer signage. It is a disaster waiting to happen.

**10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

Where are the kids going to play? On the Arterial Road?

**12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Prefer to see standard SFH on these lots

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

Too expensive. Taxes will need to be increased to maintain the lanes. This will initially be born by the buyer, but in turn will be passed on to the general public via taxation.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

Too expensive. Taxes will need to be increased to maintain the lanes. This will initially be born by the buyer, but in turn will be passed on to the general public via taxation.

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

Too expensive. Taxes will need to be increased to maintain the lanes. This will initially be born by the buyer, but in turn will be passed on to the general public via taxation.

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

The city should be developed in a radius from City Hall. This would eliminate or lessen the cost of infrastructure. Developing along the lines of arterial roads is expensive, not well thought out and unsupportable without large expenditure. Leave the arterial roads to single family homes, or small business practices.

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

The city should be developed in a radius from City Hall. This would eliminate or lessen the cost of infrastructure. Developing along the lines of arterial roads is expensive, not well thought out and unsupportable without large expenditure. Leave the arterial roads to single family homes, or small business practices.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This plan is not well thought out. There is no consideration for school closures, increased children in the neighbourhood, nor traffic control. E.G. Williams and Shell area, has train tracks, multi pedestrian operated crosswalks, and traffic already is locking up. Steveston and #5 Road is another traffic disaster. Where are these additional people going to park? Where are their children going to go to play? Where are their nannies, parents, brothers, sisters, aunts and uncles going to find recreation? How are they going to get there?

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A4V6

**32.My Name is:**

Marvin L. Skelton

**33.My e-mail address is:**

marskelart@shaw.ca

**74**

**Respondent Name :** NandE

---

Responded at 02 May 2016, 05:38 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

Yes, there are too many extremely large and unaffordable homes that are being built. we need more smaller homes being built

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

Townhouses would enable more affordable housing

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

they should be able to have 3 levels if the neighbours also have a 3rd level

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

this should be on the 3rd level also, not only 2 level as the neighbours are already 3 levels

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

we need more affordable smaller homes in the area

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;

- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

v7e2b9

**32.My Name is:**

Nadja Wojna

**33.My e-mail address is:**

nandegroup@shaw.ca

**75**

**Respondent Name :** G.M. Wong

---

Responded at 02 May 2016, 07:05 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**



[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

We know there has been a lot of talk about the direction of development the City is heading on for arterial roads. Our property is located at 9380/9382 No 2 Road and we have been advised in the past that it is suitable for townhouse development. However, we were wondering if the City was open to other kinds of development, something on a smaller scale such as front and back duplexes. We have seen these on Acheson and Bennett Road/No 3 Road area. These strata homes would be smaller and more affordable to young families or family units downsizing. With property values soaring and land values easily over \$1M, it is becoming very expensive for a developer to buy and compile enough properties to do a big townhouse development. The price of townhouses are also becoming very expensive as the land and building costs are rising at a fast pace too. The property at 9380 and 9382 No 2 Road is a side by side duplex sitting on a combined lot size of approximately 90' x 150'. The property has been stratified and there are two legal strata lots. We would like to know if the City would be looking at allowing a front and back duplex to be built on each strata lot.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2C8

**32.My Name is:**

G.M. Wong and P.L.F. Wong

**33.My e-mail address is:**

gmwong@telus.net

## 76

**Respondent Name :** Joyce

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 03:02 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

As houses are being build closer together or together, city should require developer to install sound proof walls and windows and be creative in their design to ensure each family feels that they are living in a single detached home and not in a dormitory. I find rear lane is an unsafe place where crime takes place. Developer should also consider crime prevention when designing the rear lane. I feel the city should require developer to keep the dyke whenever possible as dyke affords an incredible place for kids to experience nature; it is a pond where there are frogs, ducklings, racoons and etc. I feel wide bike lane should be included along those proposed roads to allow another form of transportation for residents and their children.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2Y3

**32.My Name is:**

Guichan Tan

**33.My e-mail address is:**

joeismuffin@yahoo.ca

**77**

**Respondent Name :** nil

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 11:39 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses



**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

I am glad there is a proposed height restriction so as to lessen the impact to existing neighbourhoods.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11.Comments:**

I would prefer even more of a setback.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

I think this should definitely be increased as noise carries.

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4R5

**32. My Name is:**

Michelle Beauchamp

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mibeau@shaw.ca

**78**

**Respondent Name :** Debby21

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 11:40 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

The rear yard first floor set-back between a town house and a SFD should be 7.5 metres as opposed to 4.5 metres; the reason being the town house should provide for an additional 3 metres replace their portion of a lane way which should have been in place in many cases. (Or in the event of a lane being established at some time in the future they would still have 4.5 metres of rear yard set-back.)

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

Is the suggestion being that "boutique" town homes will be entertained? I would rather see a SFD being maintained. This appears to be developer driven in order to maximize profit at the expense of the local community / neighbours.

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

10.

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

See comment above.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

Ensure utility vehicle access (e.g., garbage and recycling pick-up, etc.) is accommodated with lane design.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19. Comments:**

Secondary suites in the row house option does not provide enough parking for additional residents' vehicles without utilizing on-street parking.

### **20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21. Comments:**

Do not support secondary suites.

### **22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24. Comments:**

Concerns with respect to secondary suites which do not take into account the lack of parking on arterial roads. This leads to neighbourhood intrusion and conflict with established residents.

### **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### **26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5Z3

**32. My Name is:**

Debby Newton

**33. My e-mail address is:**

drnew@shaw.ca

**79**

**Respondent Name :** Paul Dmytriw

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 01:06 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

Fully support the direction this policy revision is going but feel that several locations which are noted as "not an arterial road" for the purposes of retaining the existing sfd is not showing any flexibility. SFD's backing onto No 2 near Westminster effectively have a highway outside their rear yard. relative to the Airport, Bridge, Oval, etc this is a prime area to increase density (as one example) if done in a sympathetic manner.

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

I support the proposed TH locations but I feel you should go further. Major arterials are a relatively easy way to densify without significant opposition if done right.

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

Absolutely agree. The 50m site width requirement for TH has no correlation to Richmond lot widths. One example is 10700 & 10720 Railway where the only 2 identified TH sites add up to 43.37m. One the one hand you are identifying this as TH but also saying the min. site width is not met. these are several examples of this.

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

Agree with this so as to reduce overlook and massing issues between the different forms of housing. A good example of how this didnt work is looking at 375 w King Edward in Vancouver where they allowed townhouses 3 storey to "overlook' new 2 storey laneway houses.

### **10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

I agree only where the rear yard of the development abuts an existing single family dwelling property line. In situations where a lane separates the sites a RYS should not be required (unless site specific reasons to require this).

### **12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

I agree only where the rear yard of the development abuts an existing single family dwelling property line. In situations where a lane separates the sites a RYS should not be required (unless site specific reasons to require this).

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

### **15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

I am a strong believer of F&B duplexes. I have built several and many friends live in these. This is a good, somewhat affordable type of housing that has strong demand and very little supply. I don't think this should be limited to specific sites but should be "considered" more broadly.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

I dont think this should be limited to specific sites but should be "considered" more broadly along the arterials.

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

This option should also be considered in other arterial road areas

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Generally agree but I think more flexibility needs to be considered. variations to rigid housing forms may create more affordable housing options (ie: secondary suites, stacked townhouses, etc)

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Definitely going in the right direction but feel that too many areas on the proposed Arterial map have been left out as they are being deemed "Not on Arterial". The 50m minimum site width bears no correlation to the standard Richmond site widths and should be replaced with more flexible language.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth

- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E2K5

**32. My Name is:**

Paul Dmytriw

**33. My e-mail address is:**

padmytriw@gmail.com

## 80

**Respondent Name :** Edwin

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 02:36 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

we need more density

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

good idea !

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

Reduce to 5 meters gives more options

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

Only if this will reduce traffic

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

Yes, we need housing more affordable for all Canadians

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

Common sense says yes

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

are houses needed for reasonable price

### **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

### **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**



- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E2B9

**32. My Name is:**

Edwin Lockefer

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Edwinlockefer@icloud.com

**81**

**Respondent Name :** Smart Resident

---

Responded at 03 May 2016, 08:59 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

No response

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

## Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **Board 8**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16. Comments:**

No response

### **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **See Board 10**

### **See Board 11**

### **See Board 14**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **See Board 11**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21. Comments:**

No response

### **22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Stupid Stupid Stupid web site. I completed every comment box....went into SEE BOARD # option and lost the entire survey I had almost completed. NONSENSE Not user friendly and leaves one with the impression you don't really want to know my thoughts!!!!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7a4v6

**32. My Name is:**

Arlene Skelton

**33. My e-mail address is:**

arskelpottery@shaw.ca

## 82

**Respondent Name :** Bob\_Expos

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 10:25 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**  
No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**  
No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**  
No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

I own a property which is currently rented to a young family. It is at 4571 Blundell Road. A new house was built next to it. The current option would be to sell it and a new house of approx. 4500 sq feet being built there. The ability to build a duplex or triplex would serve the community better. In addition, the new housing structure may help Grauer Elementary which is one of the 16 schools on the potential school closure list.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

We moved from England to Richmond in 1978. During that time, we have enjoyed everything Richmond has to offer. Recently, the community has changed. The on-going real estate market valuation has forced younger families to leave Richmond in pursuit of more affordable accommodations. Updating the Arterial Road Policy in Richmond would provide more options. Most new construction in Richmond revolve around large luxurious homes which are unaffordable for most residents. The ability to provide duplexes and triplexes would help encourage young families to stay in Richmond. Also, with the current issue of school closures, this would help mitigate the closure of schools. It is expected that the majority of children will live in the City Centre. Currently the majority of schools are situated outside of the City Centre. This needs to be corrected to ensure our communities are enhanced with the catchment schools throughout Richmond (not just the City Centre).

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other



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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- **Saw poster in City facility**

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2B7

**32. My Name is:**

Bob Mann

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bob\_mann@shaw.ca

**83**

**Respondent Name :** Stevestonjean

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 11:40 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook

- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E4J3

**32. My Name is:**

Jean Greatbatch

**33. My e-mail address is:**

jean\_greatbatch@telus.net

## 84

**Respondent Name :** mrtini

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 12:07 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Just means more traffic

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Keep at 6

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **Board 8**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

#### **See Board 10**

#### **See Board 11**

#### **See Board 14**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

#### **See Board 11**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

#### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C1S2

**32. My Name is:**



Mark

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mkheath@telus.net

**85**

**Respondent Name :** CKIRK

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 12:22 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Densification only makes sense when the land is actually available. Zone Changes continue until people living on arterial roads will be shoved out completely. What a pathetic effort by council to consider the people of Richmond.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7c2g2

**32. My Name is:**

Dean Beauvais

### 33. My e-mail address is:

dbeauvais@shaw.ca

## 86

**Respondent Name :** MattP

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 12:50 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Densification within our great City is critical to addressing housing affordability for Richmond residents families.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

No response

### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **9. Comments:**

I do not know enough to form a strong opinion one way or the other on this question, but support smart policy which has the flexibility to accommodate increased density where it makes sense.

### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **11. Comments:**

Again, I do not know enough to form a strong opinion one way or the other on this question, but support smart policy which has the flexibility to accommodate increased density where it makes sense.

### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

No response

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

### **15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

Very much support this concept. These types of housing options could be great starter homes for young families and seniors looking to downsize.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

I would encourage the City to explore additional potential areas

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

I would encourage the City to explore additional potential areas

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

As a young professional, born and raised in West Richmond, who would like to stay here to raise a family, I personally support densification in our City. Expanded housing supply is a crucial piece to addressing the housing affordability issue in our community. As an island, home to world class farmland, building 'up' vs. building 'out' is the only option. This is not the single magic solution, but a step in the right direction. Additional policy leadership is required from senior levels of government, but this is the right lever to pull from our local City Hall perspective.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- **Facebook**



- **Twitter**
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7c 5r4

**32. My Name is:**

Matt Pitcairn

**33. My e-mail address is:**

matt.pitcairn@gmail.com

**87**

**Respondent Name :** Jen

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 01:32 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

It's already so crowded.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

It depends on the situation and how much it affects the privacy of the neighbours and the townhouse, as well as their view being obstructed.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

How much more compact can they get? Yuck!

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

I don't know enough about this.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

It looks like there is pretty much no room for a back yard in any of these diagrams. People need

that space for mental health. Kids need it for physical health. Animals need a place to live. The environment needs trees and greenery. It's ridiculous to me that in such a lush growing climate with excellent soil, the landscape would be covered with ugly cement structures that fill entire lots. That's just disrespectful to the earth and to people.

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

### **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I think it's incredibly important to preserve Richmond's greenery. We're uniquely privileged to live in a place where plants grow so freely and abundantly, where the weather is so temperate, and where the soil is so fertile. It hurts my heart to see gorgeously grassy, flower and tree-covered lots redeveloped into frivolous houses for the rich. I feel like the City does not have the back of working middle class people like myself. (And I don't see cramming skinny townhouses onto tiny properties as a favour to people like me.)

### **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);

- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A3A9

**32. My Name is:**

Jennifer Oehler

**33. My e-mail address is:**

jennifer.oehler@gmail.com

**88**

**Respondent Name :** stephanie nomellini

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 01:50 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

too crowded, do we have services enough to accommodate? how will vehicles be able to move with extra roads/lanes/vehicles?

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

Too Crowded!

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**



- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2G2

**32. My Name is:**

Stephanie Nomellini

**33. My e-mail address is:**

stephnomellini@gmail.com

**89**

**Respondent Name :** Claire MacMorran

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 02:01 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

There is a major issue with parking along roads where townhouse and/or apartments have been developed. The traffic congestion along these streets causes issues for cars and for buses and in some cases very dangerous. Far more thought needs to go into traffic patterns prior to further development being considered.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 2T8

**32.My Name is:**

Claire MacMorran

**33.My e-mail address is:**

raclmac@telus.net

**90**

**Respondent Name :** summerland

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 04:08 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook



- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2P9

**32. My Name is:**

PETER VARSEK

**33. My e-mail address is:**

vtginc@gmail.com

## 91

**Respondent Name :** Lynne

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 04:30 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

Absolutely. We live in a neighbourhood where people are moving from the community rather than live with three storey houses alongside overshadowing yards and houses.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Greater than 4.5 metres.

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

#### **[See Board 10](#)**

#### **[See Board 11](#)**

#### **[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

#### **[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

#### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I can see increased density along arterial roads, but am opposed to the current building of enormous single-family houses to the outside edges of property with no room for gardens or normal rainwater drainage.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook

- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 3T1

**32. My Name is:**

Lynne Waller

**33. My e-mail address is:**

lynnewaller@telus.net

## 92

**Respondent Name :** alexo

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 05:04 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

No response

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e6n5

**32. My Name is:**

Alex Garner



### 33. My e-mail address is:

alexdgarnier@gmail.com

## 93

**Respondent Name :** gopher1

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 05:07 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **2. Comments:**

We are residents of Delaware Road west, as such our property backs onto 2 Road properties slated for future densification. The development already underway south of us on 2 Rd. was opposed by most residents on both 2 Rd. and Delaware Rd. in large measure because of the elevation required to meet current floodplain rules. The properties already affected on Delaware are being turned into a swamp! The backyards are overlooked by the townhouses which sit almost at the fence line and much higher in elevation overshadowing their properties making gardening and privacy a thing of the past. You need to completely rethink this process. Property owners in our situation pay the same taxes as everyone else in Richmond and we should be treated as if we do.

### **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **5. Comments:**

See my comments above.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Even this does not address the requirement of raising the land to meet current flood plain criteria as it relates to our properties. What is your plan to address this issue? It seems a far better solution to density would be to level whole areas for multi family development and leave the rest alone. Our hospital is overcrowded, people can't find a family doctor, traffic grows worse by the day and still the densification goes on. Enough is enough!

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

NOTE THE WORDS "AT LEAST" If I remember correctly every single variance requested by the developer of the above mentioned site on 2 Rd. was granted by the city. There needs to be rules not guidelines.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

It should be the same as the second floor setback. AT LEAST.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

My comments above

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

We have found the process of consultation thus far to be non-existent. An exercise in frustration slanted towards developers and development no matter the cost to the rest of us.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7c4x6

**32. My Name is:**

Bob and Carole Horner

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bobwh@shaw.ca

## 94

**Respondent Name :** Joe

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 07:04 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

**[See Board 5](#)**

**[See Board 6](#)**

**[See Board 13](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

There needs to be green space / public space considerations in addition to space for lane way. This proposal is not complete until the need of additional open space in densified lots are taken into consideration. We are squeezing a lot more people into smaller living areas. It is not healthy to have too little outdoor space. A minimum ratio of outdoor space to building foot print for these consolidated lots should be entertained if we want to continue to have a livable city

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement



- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5B4

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 95

**Respondent Name :** Sam B

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 08:24 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

Frontage requirement is a bit aggressive. Think about reducing the 50m. Should maintain flexibility to allow for duplex development in some of the townhome areas.

## **6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

No response

## **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **9. Comments:**

No response

## **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **11. Comments:**

No response

## **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **13. Comments:**

No response

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

#### **See Board 10**

#### **See Board 11**

#### **See Board 14**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

Should be expanded to more areas. (perhaps allow flexibility between duplex and townhome zoned lots.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

#### **See Board 11**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

#### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

Perhaps allow more areas to be eligible for row house development

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Need to expand this to more areas. Allow Quad-plex on one large lot (without subdivision to two lots)

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement

- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A1V9

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sam@westmarkhomes.ca

## 96

**Respondent Name :** Lsewell

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 08:33 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

## 14.Lane Network

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## 17.Arterial Road Compact Lots

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### [See Board 10](#)

### [See Board 11](#)

### [See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### [See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**



**32. My Name is:**

Laurie sewell

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Lj.sewell72@yahoo.ca

## 97

**Respondent Name :** sgustin

---

Responded at 04 May 2016, 09:53 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to**

## facilitate lane construction

### [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

#### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

#### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

#### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X2H1

**32. My Name is:**

Sarah Gustin

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sarah.gustin@gmail.com

**98**

**Respondent Name :** Kyle

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 02:44 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

All new residential construction should not exceed 2 stories. 3 stories greatly infringes on privacy and use/enjoyment of surrounding properties that were already there. 3 stories is excessive and intrusive.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

This should be greater than 4.5m, for privacy and safety reasons.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E1H9

**32. My Name is:**

Kyle

**33. My e-mail address is:**



No response

# 99

**Respondent Name :** Kanga7

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 04:50 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4J4

**32. My Name is:**

Michelle

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mbaril76@gmail.com

**100**

**Respondent Name :** Think

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 05:03 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- 
- Yes
  - **No**
  - No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 2Z4

**32. My Name is:**

Sheldon Nider

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sheldon@nider.otg

**101**

**Respondent Name :** survey

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 07:26 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**  
No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**  
No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**  
No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A2X8

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**102**

**Respondent Name :** EricS

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 09:57 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Should be 6.0 m. as well.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This is a difficult subject to implement. Kudos to efforts to get the community involved.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;

- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6B9

**32.My Name is:**

Eric Sykes

**33.My e-mail address is:**

sykes.eric@gmail.com

## 103

**Respondent Name :** dhurley

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 09:58 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

This needs to be rolled out in an orderly fashion with regards to construction zones and traffic redirection. It also needs to be monitored for actual house usage to avoid overbuilding.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses



**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

The town house complexes should be built to fit in - not stand out. And please dont allow them to be advertised as "neighbourhoods" because that is laughable. They are part of the existing neighbourhood.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Townhouses should definitely not be allowed to dominate a neighborhood with detached houses.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11.Comments:**

As an owner of a detached house I pay for the privilege of having space between me and my neighbour. That must be maintained.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

As an owner of a detached house I pay for the privilege of having space between me and my neighbour. That must be maintained.

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

I live near Westminster and No 1 Road. I believe this will the new policy will match what is in the area now.

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

Duplexes and Triplexes do not solve anyone's problems. They are an old fashioned idea that must

stop.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

All of these policy changes are proposed in response to an influx of humans into the area. What is being done to ensure that influx will be tracked so when it does not happen we can react quickly and suspend all changes.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5T2

**32. My Name is:**

Darryl Hurley

**33. My e-mail address is:**

dhurley@implestrat.com

**104**

**Respondent Name :** Sean Lawson

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 10:24 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

Density is key to this City's growth.

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

## **4. I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

No response

## **6. I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

No response

## **8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **9. Comments:**

No response

## **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 3R3

**32. My Name is:**

Sean Lawson

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sean@stevestonrealestate.com

**105**

**Respondent Name :** monicabee

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 01:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response



### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.  
I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.  
I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within

- the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
  - **A Richmond resident;**
  - A Richmond builder/developer;
  - Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

v7e5g5

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 106

**Respondent Name :** ellahuang

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 02:13 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

Need to ensure all the infrastructure including services, retails, utilities are stepping up accordingly

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Some good options

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

I don't support to have more townhouses because mostly they are not accessible, nor visitable for person with mobility disabilities; unless there's mandatory regulations that the townhouses are accessible, or at least a certain percentage.

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

Don't understand the implications of this option.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

Don't understand the implications of this option.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);

- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4K7

**32.My Name is:**

Ella Huang

**33.My e-mail address is:**

ella@rcdrichmond.org

## 107

**Respondent Name :** kathiechiu

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 02:41 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated**



## development requirements and design guidelines

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 5. Comments:

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 7. Comments:

No response

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 9. Comments:

No response

10.

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

### 11. Comments:

No response

12.

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

### **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I like that you're providing more dense housing. The back lane access is important so that driveways aren't on these roads. Good planning.

### **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y2Z4

**32. My Name is:**

Kathie Chiu

**33. My e-mail address is:**

kathie.chiu@gmail.com

## 108

**Respondent Name :** Dean04

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 10:51 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

You've already destroyed our town with monster homes and Chinese signs. This ends now you greedy picks!

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**

- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e3b5

**32. My Name is:**

Dean ben

**33. My e-mail address is:**

dean\_04@hotmail.com

## 109

**Respondent Name :** islandgal

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 11:25 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**5. Comments:**

No response



**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

No response

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**See Board 10**

**See Board 11**

**See Board 14**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**See Board 11**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**See Board 11**

**See Board 14**

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e 1y2

**32. My Name is:**

marilyn hofmann

**33. My e-mail address is:**

# 110

**Respondent Name :** Marcos604

---

Responded at 05 May 2016, 11:35 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

Yes, but should be better looking buildings and neighbourhood character. Some neighborhood should be allowed to build apartments with commercial, and affordable rental buildings, some area with all 3 storeys townhouse, some areas limited to 2 storeys, some allow stacked townhouse.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

The site should be bigger. I heard that if we have a larger site we wouldn't have to share the driveway with neighbours. I have to pay for maintenance on our driveway for other people use, not fair.

### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

But with larger setback or nice tall trees to screen the townhouse from the single family homes

### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

The more the better

### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

Not enough for tree planting and yard space. We have a tiny yard, not usable.

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

Should be all row houses with one family only per lot. Coach house Ok only if the properties on the other side of the lane can be small lots too with coach house against the lane

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

Too tight for 2 families on 1 narrow lot

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24.Comments:

Allow more row houses

### 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 27.Comments:

The houses on these roads are too big already and the duplexes would be even bigger with more cars and more paved driveways. There is no where to park more cars on Williams Road. Also there is a bike lane and there are too many driveways. I say no to 1 lot into 4 units on Williams Road. Why not allow townhouses on the minor arterial roads like Williams and put another bike lane on Francis? Townhouses on these roads could be kept at 2 storeys if you want to make them look like duplex and single family homes.

### 28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Need more commercial space in residential neighbourhood.

### 29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7a1g7

**32. My Name is:**

marco

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Marcos604@yahoo.com

## 111

**Respondent Name :** Steve Wenglowski

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 10:01 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6V 3C5

**32. My Name is:**

Steve Wengowski

**33. My e-mail address is:**

swengowski@gmail.com

## 112

**Respondent Name :** Graham Taylor

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 01:17 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

One of the stated reasons for the policy to improve affordability. As single family dwellings are

now out of reach for average families due to the proliferation of monster houses, townhouse development should encourage a very high percentage of 3 bedroom designs. Maybe it's in the guidelines but I didn't see it. My emphasis is on very high percentage

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Definitely

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

It should be more. The boards are not showing up on my computer so I don't know the height of the first floor but if they are as tall as allowed for SFD's they have to be farther back

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

#### **Board 8**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

#### **See Board 10**

#### **See Board 11**

#### **See Board 14**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

#### **See Board 11**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth

- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C1Y7

**32. My Name is:**

Graham Taylor

**33. My e-mail address is:**

grahamtaylor1954@yahoo.ca

## 113

**Respondent Name :**

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 02:11 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I only wish the city did not ignore other areas where arterial road densification could be beneficial, like north Richmond and specifically No. 4 road north of Bridgeport.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion



**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24. Comments:

No response

### 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

### 31. My postal code is (required):

**32. My Name is:**

Dale Cameron

**33. My e-mail address is:**

dale.cameron@shaw.ca

# 114

**Respondent Name :** AnneM

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 05:58 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Townhouse complex not directly on a minor arterial road should not be considered for further development as there is no access from the minor arterial road and would only create traffic issues within the neighbourhood itself

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Minimum setback that aren't invasive to existing homes should be considered

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Should be greater

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24. Comments:

No response

### 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No response

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

### 31. My postal code is (required):

V7e5p2

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Annelaure.masson@gmail.com

# 115

**Respondent Name :** CarolRuan

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 06:34 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

This should depend on the potential development of the single family lots that next to the townhouse development. If the single family houses are old and have the potential to be redeveloped as townhouse building, then it doesn't make sense to apply limitations to the earlier development.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

I don't think the new strategy will work. I'm living at the proposed lane network development area on Steveston Hwy. The house that is closes to the existing back lane is only 10 years old which won't be redeveloped in the near future, and other houses range from 30 to 40 years old which are suitable for redevelopment. I don't think any developers are willing to pay for the purchase and construction of a day-lighting lane, and then get reimbursed for the costs in 10 years or maybe even longer when the newer house get redeveloped. The more direct way to encourage builder to give up significant land to build the back lane is to increase the density in the area so the higher density can cover the costs to build the back lane.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

More row house and duplexes/triplexes developments should be encouraged so that residents with different income level or need can have more housing options, not to just choose between single family house and townhouse.

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

More row house and duplexes/triplexes developments should be encouraged so that residents with different income level or need can have more housing options, not to just choose between single family house and townhouse.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2L2

**32. My Name is:**

Carol

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sparklycarol@hotmail.com

## 116

**Respondent Name :** DNider

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 08:04 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

There has been sufficient densification in Richmond already.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

## [See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

## [See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

The more people that are crammed into small areas, the more mental health issues will erupt. the crime rate will increase and the violent crime rate will increase. If the current housing regulations are relaxed, we will wind up "warehousing" people at a terrible cost to our quality of life.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The City of Richmond needs to retain and support its single family homes. It needs to recognize that squeezing more people onto the island is not progress necessarily. At some point cities outgrow their capabilities and new cities/towns need to be built independently of existing communities. It is about quality of life, not just the economics. Having just returned from a comprehensive trip to China, I don't want Richmond to look more like those big cities there than it already does.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 2Z4

**32.My Name is:**

Debbie Nider

**33.My e-mail address is:**

debbie@nider.org

**117**

**Respondent Name :**

---

Responded at 06 May 2016, 10:19 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)



[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

More

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Why only certain blocks on minor arterial road can build duplex, what is the location criteria? I don't agree duplexes across from townhouses, should allow townhouse on my block and not duplex.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Should all the same type of development on both side of the street. Townhouses make more sense for higher density and more affordable housing. Duplex would still be very expensive.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;

- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

v7e5p7

**32.My Name is:**

pat boardman

**33.My e-mail address is:**

patboardmang@yahoo.com

**118**

**Respondent Name :** Sharon Krowchuk

---

Responded at 07 May 2016, 08:50 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

I support arterial densification if it provides more affordable housing; however, if these developments are intended for the luxury or real estate speculation market, then I do not support them. I can support densification if proactive measures are undertaken to control street parking congestion. (See additional comments section.)

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

I do not support the location of the arterial section on Railway between Blundell Rd. and Linfield Gate as Lindsay Road is already overcrowded with street parking (see additional comments section).

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

There will likely be illegal parking in the laneways. Plan for "no parking" signs.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

## 20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 21. Comments:

No response

## 22. Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## 23.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 24. Comments:

No response

## 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 27. Comments:

No response

## 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The Arterial Policy does not address street parking. The north end of Lindsay Road (my neighbourhood) is an example of the parking issues that inevitably follow densification. I have lived in this neighbourhood since 1986, when it contained mainly older, single family homes. Street parking was abundant on Lindsay. After densification of the area at the Railway/Granville junction, street parking became congested, particularly during the late afternoon to morning hours. Lindsay Road

became the overflow parking for the nearby townhouse complexes which do not provide sufficient (or sufficiently “sized”) parking spaces for residents and visitors. An additional problem was created when the older Sussex Square complex started charging for on-site parking, pushing more cars onto Lindsay Road. Special events at the local schools and community centre can periodically add to the competition for space. Holidays and celebrations bring in visitors who have difficulty finding a place to park. Delivery vehicles have to double-park. For a while, residents used a vacant lot at the north end of Lindsay as overflow parking. The City of Richmond recently barricaded the lot. The result: I noticed an increase in illegal parking in the back lane between Lindsay and Railway. An arterial section is planned for Railway between Linfield Gate and Blundell Road. McCallan Road, directly across Railway, could become a parking lot and car owners would likely jaywalk across Railway. Alternatively, cars may be parked on Lindsay Road, but this section is narrow, and has soft soil/ grass shoulders. Parked cars will likely cause damage to these grassy areas and erode the shoulders, increasing maintenance costs for the City as well as make it difficult for residents to mow the grass in front of their properties. Residents’ current options are: • complain to the Bylaw Dept. • put a traffic cone or bucket on the curb to “reserve” parking. Complaints create an adversarial neighbourhood environment and are not an effective deterrent to car owners abusing parking time limits. Currently, the City does not support “resident only parking” signs. Other Lower Mainland cities have adopted this measure and I believe the the City must reconsider its position. Car owners freely use street parking because there is no signage that says they can’t. Perhaps with signage, residents will use their garages to house their cars, rather than for extra storage space. The arterial densification is expected to improve bus service. Despite frequent bus service on Railway, my neighbourhood still has multi-car families. Some neighbourhood schools are expected to close in the foreseeable future and parents will need to drive their children to a distant school. I do not own a car and can attest that bus transit is more time consuming and inconvenient than using a car. At present, we are a car dependent city. The daily challenges of “not enough time” will preclude many residents from using transit. Cars are here to stay in the foreseeable future and ample on-site parking needs to be included in new developments. The City has allowed mega-mansions to dominate many neighbourhoods in Richmond. These environmentally unfriendly structures use a large quantity of land and materials (wood, copper plumbing, etc.), yet do not actually house many people, if any at all. These areas are effectively de-densified. Are the residents in or near the arterial areas expected to bear the brunt of densification, while mega-mansion owners enjoy the benefits of low density (lower traffic, lower exhaust emissions, lower noise)?

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2P5

**32. My Name is:**



Sharon Krowchuk

**33. My e-mail address is:**

s\_krow@telus.net

# 119

**Respondent Name :** parrott

---

Responded at 07 May 2016, 09:50 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

BUT, building height should not materially exceed that of homes to either side or the rear.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

second storey setback should be minimum ten metres.

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

ground floor setback should be minimum ten metres.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to**

## facilitate lane construction

### [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

#### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

#### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

If a developer chooses to present a proposal/ application that does NOT comply with city policy, then the Application should include outcomes/ results of prior public consultation. In other words, the City should not be accepting APPLICATIONS for zoning/ permits which don't generally comply with established policies unless the developer has already canvassed the neighbourhood/ stakeholders and includes the results, presumably favourable, therefrom with his application.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4S5

**32.My Name is:**

John Parrott

**33.My e-mail address is:**

jsparrott@shaw.ca

# 120

**Respondent Name :** Ed

---

Responded at 07 May 2016, 10:14 AM

**1.  
I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

I oppose the continued densification of Richmond and destruction of existing neighbourhoods. I have lost faith in the ability of the city to manage planning after the continued replacement of family houses with paved, gated properties that overhang roads and neighboring properties creating canyons, and with all the trees removed (whatever the regulations supposedly say).

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.  
I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e1l7

**32. My Name is:**



Ed Robinson

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Edwin.robinson@alumni.ubc.ca

# 121

**Respondent Name :** chubrian

---

Responded at 07 May 2016, 03:47 PM

**1. I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No. I don't support the densification because of how it identifies suitable areas for densification. The closer an area is to the city center, the more densification there should be. It's not the case in the proposed plan. My lot at 8220 Gilbert Rd is not even under consideration. With 14,000 square feet, my lot can accommodate at least 4 single detached houses. But, I can only have one single house under current zoning. That is ridiculous. The zoning is forcing me and my neighbours to build monster houses. Just look at the new houses immediately to my left, two brand new huge monster houses. More are being built right now. There is no densification. City of Richmond should encourage building small single houses, not monster houses that only rich foreign investors can afford.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4. I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

I, personally, do not support any more town house development in Richmond, especially townhouses built with wood and other flammable materials. The fire risk of the whole town house go up in flame is great. The risk increases as the age of the town house increases as the infrastructure ages, the cost of maintenance increase. On top of that, strata act in BC is being taken advantage of by professional strata councillors. There several groups of these people, often consisted of realtors, buy up townhouses and condo so they can be councillors. They can easily be elected as councillors because who else has time to volunteer to be on the council. They then use their power to get constructions contracts and kick backup. In a word, to increase house density, please go for smaller lots, smaller but taller, houses, or even compact-lots or micro-house. If there is a really need for town-house, please at least force the developer to use concrete.

**6.  
I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Of course, town houses should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots. Who wants to live next to a town-house that can overlook your home !

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

Yes. The further the better.

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Yes. The further the better.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No, because my lot is not even under consideration.

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

From the pictures, rowhouses look just like town-houses. No clear separation... just the same fire risk as the town house. I cannot support it.

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No, because my lot is not even under consideration.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an**

arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);

- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 3W6

**32.My Name is:**

BRIAN CHU

**33.My e-mail address is:**

brian333def@gmail.com

**122**

**Respondent Name :** Rmdsuperman

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 07:56 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

More affordable housing the better

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**9. Comments:**

No response

10.

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

Only if each unit can't smaller than 1600 sft..

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;



- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y1C7

**32. My Name is:**

Chien Chung Lee

**33. My e-mail address is:**

selow0621@yahoo.com.tw

**123**

**Respondent Name :** Alan

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 09:52 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Without densification the population will not increase. The price of housing is tightly coupled to desirability of Richmond as a place to live. The number of people that want to live here in Richmond will continue to increase at a such a rate that densification will achieve only that - making Richmond a more densely populated place to live.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**  
No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**  
No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**  
No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes

- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2M1

**32.My Name is:**

Alan Swain

**33.My e-mail address is:**

aswain@telus.net

**124**

**Respondent Name :** momof2

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:00 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

I think design guidelines must be site specific - perhaps in consultation with the single family housing that would be affected by the construction (eg. site lines, sun exposure, removal of trees)

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

I think it should be the same as the existing 6.0 m for single family homes, if this is possible. That

way, the neighbours won't feel that the townhouse isn't any closer than the previous house. Most town homes are 3 stories in Richmond, so they will have to get used to the increased height already.

#### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

#### **15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

##### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **16.Comments:**

This will be a very hard sell to the single family homes who currently back onto these existing lots and who will now have a lane in the back of their home and a street in the front. I suggest, having a green space on the lot being developed between the existing single family homes and the lane way to try to reduce noise and pollution to their properties.

#### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

#### **18. I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

##### **[See Board 10](#)**

##### **[See Board 11](#)**

##### **[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

#### **19.Comments:**

I lived in one of these in Vancouver and it was a great set up. Again, the addition of lanes to existing single family properties, will be a challenge. I encourage you to have a small green space between the lanes and the existing single family homes as they will not be looking into people's garages. Even if it is row of

#### **20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

##### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

## **21. Comments:**

I feel we will lose a lot of green space when you have the attached garage and then the paved area behind it leading into the garage off of the lane way. I can assure you that existing single family dwellings will NOT like looking at the garage of a house with a paved entrance to it and no yard.

## **22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## **23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **24. Comments:**

No response

## **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## **26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **27. Comments:**

I like the idea of these as they don't involve adding a lane, which I think will be an easier sell to the neighbours.

## **28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I understand the need to increase the density of homes in Richmond and to provide all different types of alternatives. I am concerned about the additions of lanes, which is another road, really, as I feel that the neighbours will not like this (I live in a townhouse, so I am just anticipating their concerns). My other primary concern is traffic. The intersection at Blundell and No. 4 is already a challenge and it hasn't been "densified" yet. It is a problem with turning left heading east onto



Blundell, especially when the street parking is in effect. With the increased housing going in, we really need to take a good look at traffic, increasing transit, good walkways and dedicated bike routes to help get people out of their cars, otherwise it is going to be a traffic nightmare.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 4H3

**32. My Name is:**

Catherine Ellens

**33. My e-mail address is:**

cellens@shaw.ca

**125**

**Respondent Name :** Common Sense

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:14 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Yes as long as it is in harmony with adjacent properties. For example new structures too close or too high should not be permitted if they block too much light or invade privacy. Developments should not be able to look down in someones back yard or back deck/patio. Lets use some common sense in planning and protect privacy as a priority.

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

#### **4. I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

With some exceptions. If a road already has a section of newer higher density houses they should not be redeveloped. Just because you are on a main road every parcel should not be redeveloped. Why not use common sense in planning?

#### **6. I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

#### **8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No more than 2 storeys with a height restrictions as well.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

6 m too close should be 8 m min.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

too close 6.5 m min

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

As long as done with proper setbacks and look pleasing. Why are so many structures in Richmond look like boxes?

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Lets respect the rights of existing long property owners. Developers have had free run in Richmond for far too long. Why does Richmond have so many more zoning revisions than other City's in greater Vancouver? My does Richmond keep increasing its density when other Cities do not ? It is sad families cannot afford to live in Richmond anymore due to actions at City Hall.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4S3

**32. My Name is:**

Robert Bebluk

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bebluk@gmail.com

**126**

**Respondent Name :** Graeme

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:52 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I think it needs to go further and include low-rise apartment buildings with an increase to mid-rise near the neighbourhood centres. Also, there needs to be discussion about possible new retail corridors along some arterials (No 4, Gilbert) so more people can walk/cycle to local shopping destinations. In an effort to limit increase in arterial auto traffic, a larger share of development fees should be specifically allocated to cycling infrastructure.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

## [See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

No response

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16. Comments:**

I think it should be expanded wherever possible.

### **17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

## Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

Fee simple rowhouses should be allowed to be built anywhere along the arterials, not just in certain locations.

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes



**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Not sure why there needs to be separation between possible compact lot, townhouse, duplex/triplex, and rowhouse locations. A variety of housing choices within every neighbourhood makes for a more interesting city. This variety should include low-rise apartments and stacked townhouses. Arterial development priority should be given to areas near schools with shrinking student populations.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y0B7

**32. My Name is:**

Graeme Bone

**33. My e-mail address is:**

graemeandrewbone@gmail.com

**Respondent Name :** Linda222

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 04:42 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

I would not encourage densification along arterial roads as I think Rmd is busy enough with traffic, parking and the lack of garden space.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

I did attend an open house and looked at the boards there. People were encouraged not to fill in paperwork with their opinion due to saving paper. All good. However, I don't think this survey is very user friendly as it is harder on a computer to go back and forth looking at "boards". I am against adding more townhouses along the main roads.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

I would not allow more flexibility. This would allow more density, parking problems, lack of green space for families.

### **8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

No response

### **10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

No response

### **12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **13. Comments:**

I think this is what is currently is. if that is so, I am for it. I am against making this a smaller number.

### **14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

### **15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No

- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

Again, for the reason of too high density.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6Y 3K3

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

# 128

**Respondent Name :** Blueriver

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 05:02 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

New construction is much higher than older houses. Care needs to be taken to protect the privacy of existing dwellings. It is not right that older back yards become the views for new construction. Back yards should strive to be as large as possible to give neighbours breathing room.

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.  
The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes

- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19. Comments:**

This appears to be a workable idea.

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

I will not be directly affected, so should not express my opinion on this question.

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**



**24. Comments:**

see above

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

When the arterial policy was first introduced, we were told that it was necessary because front-access driveways along busy main streets (arterials) were an impediment to traffic. The current problem is that people in the new dwellings on arterials are now allowed to park on the street for much of the day, thus negating any traffic-moving benefit from these developments. Parking along arterials should be forbidden. This policy is especially dumb along No. 1 Road where the original lots did not have front driveways in the first place. Here, where there once was free-moving two-lane traffic in both directions, people can now park on the street when they should be forced to park at the backs of their properties. This is not 1980 anymore. Rush hour extends well into the evening - 9:30 pm on No. 1 Road. It is time to get these parked cars off the street. It is dangerous when traffic that wants to drive in the curb lane (e.g., buses) is forced to continually weave from lane to lane in order to avoid parked cars.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C3X6

**32. My Name is:**

M. Smith

**33. My e-mail address is:**

riverdale@shaw.ca

## 129

**Respondent Name :** Scrubbers

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 07:51 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

But with density comes the responsibility to add green space, as people have less personal space...Also community centres, library, schools and daycares.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**5. Comments:**

Board 5 tree retention is not happening on single family lots now

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

Except maybe providing ways to change design to retain trees. This is not being done well on single family lots currently. So when you add density and keep guidelines so tight, there is not ways to keep the trees.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

I have a problem with what is already in guideline in terms of landscaping! Trees being used are often varieties which get too large. A good example of this is on Williams Rd between Shell Rd and 4Rd. The trees sit within standard width sidewalk and appear to be planted without anticipating adequate room for a wheelchair, scooter or stroller and this is not accounted for tree increase in girth and roots. Without adequate room for root growth (by using wider sidewalk, structural cells, etc. the sidewalks have now started to heave and are creating trip hazards and exacerbating already poor accessibility. Other developments seem to be putting tree in the front yard of the development and are using varieties which will get too big so, tree end up having to be removed prematurely. I have seen some sites with 2 trees in this space which again is too much and will very quickly cause problems for the complex and/or the trees. Tree species being used should be only varieties that do not get to big -or large shrubs Instead, of the 2 for 1 replacement, maybe the one tree is replaced by 1 tree on site which is appropriate size for the site. For example, I saw a good lilac used on boulevard next to new devlopement as it does not grow too big as even so-called "small trees" like Japanese maple or Dogwood, for example which eventually will grow too big for higher density sites or boulevards. And the 2nd street instead of also being on site, could be planted elsewhere in the city (such as at parks) to increase overall tree canopy in the city.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

We lived in Vancouver previously, in a neighbourhood that piloted new housing forms. After the new policies were implemented there, some things happened that were not what was expected. Therefore, I suggest a review so be taken after as 1 year and see if new policy amendments are having the desired effect, with no unintended or unexpected consequences, then see if further adjustments still need to be made.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

## **20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

The apartment over garage (the "Fonzie" suite) was a great idea, but abandoned in Vancouver because people started filling in the garage as part of the suite, which pushed more cars onto the street because everyone gave away their garage parking spaces to living space.

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23. I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

Except on ALR And light industrial land should be maintained. The little piece on 5 Rd on ALR side of the street should not be touched. It's enough to have large churches that should be farming back areas or making allotment gardens etc. The Steveston Hwy ALR side should also be kept as farmland and amendments to sizes of housing structures should be changed to keep them as working farmland not as loopholes to build monster homes. Be aware of impact of school closures .

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### **26. I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

Same as above.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The one area they did not touch on is accessibility with an aging population and people currently with disabilities. I think that there should be a requirement (rather than an encouragement) to build 10 to 20 per cent of housing with at least the potential to be reasonably modified for disabilities (e.g. potential elevator shaft within stairwell). Not so expensive at beginning, but not possible later. Should be development permit requirement, not just a suggestion to developer.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A4W1

**32. My Name is:**

Kim Nulty

**33. My e-mail address is:**

nultytowers@poradadesign.com

**130**

**Respondent Name :** Vicki

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:04 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2.Comments:**

No response

## **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7.Comments:**

I support this point with huge qualifications. This has GOT to be done with the full consultation and approval of the people in the surrounding neighbourhood, not just the immediate neighbours. There is evidence all over Richmond that the construction of townhouses adds to the cars parked on the street in numbers that seem to be unpredicted by the city. We have seen, in the townhouses around McNeill Secondary - 4 Road and Blundell area - that people who buy townhouses don't park their cars in their garages, for whatever reason, but on the street. So the construction of every townhouse complex will affect the street parking (read: visitors) of each single family home for quite a ways away from the actual townhouse development. Older townhouses built along Steveston Hwy, east of No. 1 Road don't have this problem. There is a lot of available parking for residents, their second cars, and their visitors. New complexes don't have all this on-site available parking, but should. Requiring this extra parking, rather than the minimum number of visitor spaces, will make a more pleasant development, give room for children to play, solve the parking problem, and, perhaps most important, keep the surrounding neighbours happy. This may mean fewer units per site for the developers, which will cut down on their profits. A little time spent with a calculator will show that developers can still be profitable with less density, regardless of their claims.

**8. Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

4.5 metres is not quite 15 feet, not very much space. This setback size should be viewed not only as a privacy issue for the houses behind, but with the realization that many of the future children of Richmond will live in townhouses. They will need back yards to play in. We support, as a country, children playing outside and keeping fit. Children cannot do that if we, as a city, do not give them safe places to play, not only during a family visit to a park, but also while adults are doing chores inside, such as cooking dinner.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

I fully support more lanes in Richmond.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

I support the concept generally, but I think your 1.2 metre side setback is too narrow. Residents need space for a ladder to wash windows and clean gutters without needing to place their ladders in their neighbours yards. I have heard of several cases recently where even the best neighbours have refused permission (concerns about liability), I know people who are using scaffolding each time they want to clean their gutters and/or wash their windows. The city should prevent this situation by requiring a larger side setback. Perhaps the minimum size lot for the Compact Lot Duplexes is too small. My house, which is not very large, sits on a 4,000 square foot lot, and your minimum size lot for 2 residences is 360 square metres, or 3,875 square feet. I have serious concerns about the success of this on so small a lot, while keeping the neighbours happy.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 24. Comments:

We need more locations for row house development. I imagine row house development will become popular, as there are desirable similarities to townhouses without the hassle of a strata council.

### 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

It's hard to read on the plan as it's so small, but it appears, again, that your side setbacks are too small.

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Setbacks need to be at least what they are now, and not reduced further. My house is 5'-0" (1.524 metres) to my side lot line. There is room for a very narrow planter to soften the feel, a fence, and a walkway just wide enough for a lawn mower. I wouldn't want it any narrower, and yet, you are proposing side setbacks of a little less than 4'-0" (1.2 meters). Like good fences and good neighbours, there is a lot to be said for space. There needs to be enough space between houses so that residents can do routine maintenance on their homes without having to go to extreme measures, such as putting up scaffolding. We count on the city to ensure this. Another concern relates to residents health, protection from road pollution and noise, and the required landscaping for housing on main roads. Traffic on busy roads creates a lot of pollution. There will be many families living in these townhouses, duplexes, triplexes and row houses. These people deserve the right to clean air, not to mention noise protection. The easiest way to do this is to ensure developers plant tall, evergreen trees between the housing and the road. I know there is a mixed requirement now, between deciduous and evergreen, but the planted trees are small, taking many years to reach the top floors (bedroom levels) of the townhouses. Deciduous trees are lovely in the summer, but in the winter provide no protection at all for the residents. Setbacks in front need to be large enough to allow for healthy, mature, tall evergreen trees to protect the residents all year round from car and road pollution and noise.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 4L5

**32.My Name is:**

Vicki Lingle

**33.My e-mail address is:**

vklingl@hotmail.com

**131**

**Respondent Name :** John ter Borg

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:09 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**5. Comments:**

Set them forward. Get rid of the gates and fences. Get off of the back fence line. Give everyone more space.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

More assembly requirements allow for more creativity and opportunities for better housing form and functional green space.

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

One storey is preferred.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

8 m is appropriate. As per the Metro Vancouver average setback for single family lots.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

6 m is appropriate depth for single storey setbacks.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **19. Comments:**

These housing forms misallocate green space in the front of the property. The inclusion of walls and gate diminishes the connection to the street and takes away from opportunities for trees and vegetation which provides greater benefits, including noise reduction and privacy. These housing types are so close together that they might as well be attached with communal green space provided as a shared amenity for nearby residents and children to engage in outdoor activities close to home. 10', 12', and 20' foot ceilings don't belong in the smaller lot houses, in anything attempting to be affordable, or on properties with secondary residences like coach houses. A culture of aggrandizing that seeks to 'maximize' everything is getting in the way of really creative housing forms.

## **20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **21. Comments:**

No response

## **22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **24. Comments:**

No response

## **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## **26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

## 27. Comments:

It is difficult to support 8 cars on a property where there were only 2 before. It is a lot of paving. Parking can be encouraged at street level in the front. Houses can be conjoined to allow a better use and more green space on the lot.

## 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

If the vision is to build complete communities, then increased density does not need to mean increased congestion. Engage the Professional Design Community The City should engage the professional design community. One such way is to host a design competition as a way to include the input, creativity and professional skills of architects and urban planners. Prizes could be awarded for the top three contributions, and the City could choose to work with the top firms to adapt a functional policy. A recent example is from Edmonton. <http://edmontoninfilldesign.ca/> <http://edmontoninfilldesign.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Infill-Design-Competition-Brief-Mar-4.pdf> New ideas can emerge from a scenario that addresses relevant parameters such as building form, landscaping, green space, subdivisions, consolidations, and buildability. As well as basic community concerns about setbacks, building heights, and interfaces with single-family housing. Garages For a housing type that is supposed to be affordable and transit oriented, why are there so many new garages? Car ownership has changed and is changing rapidly. Alternatives include carpooling, staggered workdays, telecommuting, carsharing, ridesharing, and home based businesses enabled by the internet and the new economy that have allowed us to change our driving behaviours and our dependence on vehicles in ways that were not imaginable in previous decades. For some families it is possible to downsize from owning two cars. Building Smaller 10', 12', and 20' foot ceilings don't belong in the smaller lot houses, in anything attempting to be affordable, or on properties with secondary residences like coach houses. A culture of aggrandizing that seeks to 'maximize' everything is getting in the way of really creative housing forms. Such as ideas presented by some of the links below. Livability for a range of users Richmond's residents are diverse and housing options should be as well. Not everyone is looking for a traditional single family house or even a three storey townhouse. Ground oriented housing forms appeal to people with mobility challenges, people with pets, people who want to garden or appreciate nature. Small families, single parent families, blended families, extended families, individuals, young couples, seniors, downsizers, all have different expectations and needs. Other jurisdictions have adapted building bylaws to allow developers to build in more creative ways. Some of these unique housing types include: Pocket neighbourhoods <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k749w3cHSPk> <https://vimeo.com/21052791> <http://rosschapin.com/projects/pocket-neighborhoods/> <http://pocket-neighborhoods.net/patterns/shared.html> <http://www.pocket-neighborhoods.net/mediatoolbox/PNStoryIdeas.pdf> Backyard neighbourhoods <http://www.cottagecompany.com/Communities/Backyard-Neighborhood/Backyard-Neighborhood-Site-Plan.aspx> <http://www.cottagecompany.com/for-sale/listing-detail.aspx?lid=22> Row houses <https://www.arlnow.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Rosslyn-Commons.jpg> <http://m2jstudio.com/images/MJSKETCHBOOK/2013/UB00100.jpg> <http://3.bp.blogspot.com/-Ebc3vo2mato/UsDi0TN5IOI/AAAAAAAAAHBM/KKF-AiWgzgY/s1600/Toronto+fee+simple+row+houses.jpg> <http://assets.inhabitat.com/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/2014/04/Lady-Peel-House-Atelier-RZLBD-1.jpg> <http://m5.i.pbbase.com/g6/52/479852/2/82935695.KLM3171F.jpg> Images [http://rosschapin.com/wp/wp-content/gallery/project\\_pn\\_gac/project\\_pn\\_gac01.jpg](http://rosschapin.com/wp/wp-content/gallery/project_pn_gac/project_pn_gac01.jpg) <https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/736x/76/d1/0d/76d10db977828b5ff8ab3c9df4886571.jpg> <https://s-media-cache-ak0.pinimg.com/736x/5b/b4/98/5bb49879aae3dd58747043e24776e353.jpg> <http://www.liveability.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Berkley-cohousing-US-plan.jpg> <http://www.fourlightshouses.com/pages/the-napoleon-complex> A recent affordable housing presentation put on by Michael Geller. A local developer whose eyes have been opened to more creative housing options. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QLkkYaMnqRM>

## 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within

- the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
  - **A Richmond resident;**
  - A Richmond builder/developer;
  - Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 3P7

**32.My Name is:**

John ter Borg

**33.My e-mail address is:**

john\_terborg@hotmail.com

**132**

**Respondent Name :** clam

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**



**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

6m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

v7e1k2

**32.My Name is:**

Cynthia Lam

**33.My e-mail address is:**

clam1984815@yahoo.ca

**133**

**Respondent Name :** CW

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:34 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

more

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

a lot more

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

no new lane

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes

- No
- **No Opinion**

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e5j3

**32. My Name is:**

Chi Wah Li

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**134**

**Respondent Name :** MChan

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:44 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)



- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

should be larger site

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

should be 6m or more

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **27.Comments:**

why these locations? i thought the higher density is to be located near the shopping centers. the density allowed in duplex seems to be higher than the what is allowed on compact lots, and the density is very close to what is allowed in townhouses. strongly oppose to the locations proposed.

### **28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

### **29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E5S2

**32. My Name is:**

Michael Chan

**33. My e-mail address is:**

nepg@yahoo.com

## 135

**Respondent Name :** pssandhu

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 08:56 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

don't allow piece meal development. should develop the entire block at the same time.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

6 m

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

## 22.Arterial Road Rowhouses

Arterial Road Rowhouses

23.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 24.Comments:

like the small unit on my own lot, but why only on arterial road?

## 25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 27.Comments:

the duplex are too big, much bigger than the single home next door now, out of character should not allow subdivision, not narrow lot 1 house change into 2 units ok, but overall size should be the same as a single home, mix it up ok, but no big new buildings

## 28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

ok with higher density in certain areas should allow different things in different area higher density like small apartment when it is close to the city centre lower density likes 3 storey townhouse a bit further away and low density likes 2 storey townhouse even further away duplexes should not be allowed on major roads

## 29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;

- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e 1j9

**32. My Name is:**

Paul Sandhu

**33. My e-mail address is:**

pssandhu67@gmail.com

## 136

**Respondent Name :** home

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 09:02 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**



[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- **Saw poster in City facility**

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5M2

**32. My Name is:**

Peter Smith

**33. My e-mail address is:**

smithpbc@yahoo.com

## 137

**Respondent Name :** honeyB

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 09:12 PM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

looks very tight to allow 4 duplex units on 1 lot

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth

- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e 5x9

**32. My Name is:**

Beth Martin

**33. My e-mail address is:**

kissofhoneyb@yahoo.com

## 138

**Respondent Name :** I don't have one.

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 09:22 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion



### **5. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **7. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **9. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **11. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**

- No Opinion

### **13.Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

### **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

The city is already way too dense! Please, no more!

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Sorry, this is not very helpful but The city is already way too dense! Please, no more! We are so upset about the over-population and all the traffic in the Lower Mainland that we are considering moving to the Island when we retire in Jan 2017. We feel the need to live with nature, not surrounded by concrete and development.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within

- the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
  - **A Richmond resident;**
  - A Richmond builder/developer;
  - Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5H9

**32.My Name is:**

Denise McDougal

**33.My e-mail address is:**

dmcdougal@shaw.ca

**139**

**Respondent Name :** EBrown

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 09:27 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

townhouse is the best to make homes more affordable, build smaller units

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

no new lanes, not safe, unless there are laneway housing on both sides of the lane

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

will it be too tight to have 2 units in this small lot?

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

small single family home make it more affordable, I like there is a back yard

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

the duplex won't be more affordable, the units are still very big, and people will have many cars, looks like there will be a lot of paving and lots of driveways. I prefer to see townhouses at these locations, maybe limited to 2 storeys and maybe limited to duplex style instead of huge long tall townhouse buildings we see else where on the arterial road?

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

build more relatively more affordable units, duplex/triplex is not the solution. family needs to share facilities to keep the cost low. what about all units facing one yard space and shared, everyone share one parking lot and we build less parking (flexible to allocate between residents and visitors, not every family has 2 cars). why not build more bike lanes to encourage people to bike?

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

v7e 1k2

**32. My Name is:**

Ester Brown

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mtechvan@yahoo.com

**140**

**Respondent Name :** DM1211

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:07 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion



**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E5M3

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

# 141

**Respondent Name :** Eggplant

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:08 PM

**1. I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4. I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

Setbacks should be as much as possible. I'd like to see the rear setback (ground level and second story) even greater. The foundation level of the townhouse developments is so high compared to the preexisting single family developments. Having a very tall rear neighbour would be a large negative impact.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

See above.

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- 
- **Yes**
  - No
  - No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;

- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7e5t5

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**142**

**Respondent Name :** Sahara

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 10:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

We have enough new development and don't need anymore. Until all the condos are full, there is absolutely need to build anymore.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)



[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

It will change the entire neighbourhood just like Cambie and Oak Street in Vancouver.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

By going through these development, the city has virtually destroy Richmond. I have live in Richmond over 25 years and always enjoy the community spirits and the green spaces. The existing council has destroy Richmond and turning our city into a concrete city. Cutting down all the trees and the neighborhood. This is not the city that we have build. Please don't destroy our beautiful city and we really don't need to build anymore.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2C8

**32.My Name is:**

Helen

**33.My e-mail address is:**

sahara10@me.com

## 143

**Respondent Name :** 6479

---

Responded at 08 May 2016, 11:28 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5C5

**32.My Name is:**

Derek Williams

**33.My e-mail address is:**

Bopakderek@gmail.com

# 144

**Respondent Name :** bobw

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 12:06 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2.Comments:**

I support the principle behind the Arterial Roads Policy. But the gods, and devils, dwell in the details, and the unacceptable details of this proposed policy make it impossible to support such an important, far reaching policy that would affect the lives of tens of thousands of Richmond residents when it incorporates measures that would be unfair and unacceptable to existing homeowners and residents. Changes should be made to ensure that densification approaches do not erode and compromise rights and equities of owners of adjacent and near-neighbour residential properties.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion



## 5. Comments:

Changes are required to these development requirements and design guidelines. 1. It should specify who has the final say on whether massing and building heights "are respectful" of adjacent developments. Exactly what does "respectful" mean? 2. Who determines what constitutes "an appropriate interface"? They could be just empty, feel-good words, with no tangible substance or enforceability. 3. Speaking of vague and empty rhetoric... The amendment claims it will "clarify" building heights and setbacks along rear-yard interfaces with single-family housing. It states, for example, that building height along the rear-yard interface with single-family homes should be "2 storeys". What does that mean? To be meaningfully consistent, why doesn't it state that building height should be limited to 9 metres -- the same standard that now is being applied to new single-family houses? 4. Single-family houses are required to have a 6-metre (20 ft.) rear-yard setback. I understand that houses may have limited intrusions along a portion of this setback, for a bay window, for example. Townhouses along a rear-yard interface with single-family houses should be subject to the same rules. Contrary to what is being proposed, townhouses should not be permitted to have the entire width of their ground floors observe only a 4.5-metre (15 ft) setback). Townhouses should have a minimum 6-metre (20 ft) ground-floor setback, with only limited extensions of up to 1.5 metres (5 ft) along certain portions of the width of the rear wall. Why is Richmond proposing to dilute the rear-yard setback options already provided in the current guidelines? Why is the proposal scrapping the provision that 6-metre (20-ft) rear-yard setbacks may be required "where deemed necessary?" Why is the proposal not incorporating and continuing the existing stipulations that any intrusions into the 6-metre (20 ft) setback must be "subject to: -- appropriate opportunities for tree planting; -- the provision of appropriate private outdoor space?" These considerations must be embodied in any revised policy involving rear-yard setbacks in interfaces with single-family housing.

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 7. Comments:

1. It should specify who has the final say on whether massing and building heights "are respectful" of adjacent developments. Exactly what does "respectful" mean? 2. Who determines what constitutes "an appropriate interface"? They could be just empty, feel-good words, with no tangible substance or enforceability.

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 9. Comments:

The amendment claims it will "clarify" building heights and setbacks along rear-yard interfaces with single-family housing. It states, for example, that building height along the rear-yard interface with

single-family homes should be "2 storeys". What does that mean? To be meaningfully consistent, why doesn't it state that building height should be limited to 9 metres -- the same standard that now is being applied to new single-family houses? To be meaningful, measurable and enforceable, there has to be an explicit maximum height.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

1. Single-family houses are required to have a 6-metre (20 ft.) rear-yard setback. I understand that houses may have limited intrusions along a portion of this setback, for a bay window, for example. Townhouses along a rear-yard interface with single-family houses should be subject to the same rules: THEY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO HAVE 6-METRE (20 FT) SETBACKS FROM ADJOINING SINGLE-FAMILY PROPERTIES. Contrary to what is being proposed, townhouses should not be permitted to have the entire width of their ground floors observe only a 4.5-metre (15 ft) setback). Townhouses should have a minimum 6-metre (20 ft) ground-floor setback, with only limited extensions of up to 1.5 metres (5 ft) along certain permitted and specified portions of the width of the rear wall. 2. Why is Richmond proposing to dilute the rear-yard setback options already provided in the current guidelines? Why is the proposal scrapping the provision that 6-metre (20-ft) rear-yard setbacks may be required "where deemed necessary?" Why is the proposal not incorporating and continuing the existing stipulations that any intrusions into the 6-metre (20 ft) setback must be "subject to: -- appropriate opportunities for tree planting; -- the provision of appropriate private outdoor space?" These considerations must be embodied in any revised policy involving rear-yard setbacks in interfaces with single-family housing.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

ONCE AGAIN, MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS ARE NOT SPECIFIED. WHY? This proposed housing form could be acceptable if maximum heights are no greater than the 9-metre maximum heights for single-family houses.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 4Y2

**32. My Name is:**

ROBERT WILLIAMSON

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bob@ivancorp.net

# 145

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:00 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

2 Storey Maximum

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

25 feet minimum!

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I moved to Richmond 43 years ago, quiet secluded single family lots. If you want to densify build high rise concrete construction that will last and not leak and deteriorate in 20 years!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2G\_

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response



# 146

Respondent Name : Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:08 AM

1.

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

4.

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

6.

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

8.

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2H3

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**147**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:15 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to**

accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Need more setback from arterial road.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

8 to 10 m minimum.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

6 to 8 minimum. Patios need sunlight and air circulation, space from SF lots across.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

---

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No

- **No Opinion**

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Road congestion is a current problem and will increase with development. What's the plan on that in the affected arterial roads and adjacent roadways?

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**148**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:19 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No



- No Opinion

## **2.Comments:**

No response

## **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

No response

## **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes

- No
- **No Opinion**

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A 1E6

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**149**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:25 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

The densification is long overdue on these roads to respond to the current needs of the local community.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

See comment in #1

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

See comment in #1

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

This will respect the existing housing.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.  
I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

In addition to the above higher density options, there should be an option for more modest size single family homes on smaller lots (e.g., 33 ft. lots) similar to that of Garry Street between Railway and #1 Road. This initiative for rezoning is essential to enable Richmond to have affordable housing options.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2B9

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**150**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:41 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses



**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

Definitely should be limited to 2 storey hopefully for some living privacy.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

See above.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**  
No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**  
No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**  
No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

As these developments take place please, please ensure that the trees are planted and there is plenty of grassy areas in our City! The next generation of children need to see nature near where they live - i.e. they can enjoy outside time right at their doorstep!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2Y8

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**151**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:51 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

My only concern is if there would be long stretches of homes that look the same. There must be a mix of different housing types!

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

I like that you are proposing that the design fronting local roads should look like single family dwellings. Landscaping trees/shrubs are very important!!!

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

This is a huge liveability factor for the neighbours.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

Could be more!

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

Could be more!

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

No response

**16.Comments:**

I don't think developers should be able to recoup the cost of a "daylight" lane that is created to access a major road. It is the cost of doing business!

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

re: Arterial Road Duplex Type II: Very cramped looking, one visitor parking space may not be enough! See 9 next page!

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

No response

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

Very European concept! Like it! Separate and shared multi-garages are very common!

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

Where appropriate.

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This Arterial Road Policy update has been very thought through! I appreciate that it includes landscaping, trees/shrubs. It is a good way to densify in a more unobtrusive way. It is important

that certain neighbourhoods retain their character even after densification i.e. Terra Nova, Riverdale, etc. I appreciate the multiple housing types that have been depicted. Good luck! Planning Department! E.S.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 1B7

**32. My Name is:**

Erika Simm

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**152**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 09:55 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response



### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.  
I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.  
I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.  
Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.  
The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Good plans.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);

- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- **Saw poster in City facility**

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6S1

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**153**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:00 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

Railway needs to be wider.

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Laurelwood - Lynnwood Drive needs a proper access road and not use the fire lane.

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No extension on roof.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

Look at Laurelwood, Lynnwood Drive Complex Lindsay and others use our (circled) FIRE LANE.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

In certain places only.

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;

- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5S9

**32. My Name is:**

Corinne Gevaert

**33. My e-mail address is:**

cgevaert@telus.net

**154**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:05 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)



[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

Would like to see more setback.

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I think that the proposals shown here appear to be a good balance. I would like to see a larger set back when townhouses encroach on single family homes (at least same as duplex). Given that more units will increase noise there should be consideration to reduce noise (greenspace/trees e.g.)

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2J4

**32.My Name is:**

Kathy Kolb

**33.My e-mail address is:**

Kmarcinokolb@gmail.com

**155**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:08 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

ABSOLUTELY NOT

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

**[See Board 5](#)**

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

NO! NO! NO!

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

NO!

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be**

at least 4.5 m

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

YOU CANNOT KEEP DEVELOPING WITHOUT A PLAN FOR TRAFFIC OR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION!! ALL THE DEVELOPMENT IS CREATING NIGHTMARES FOR GETTING AROUND THIS IS ALL A TAX GRAB BY THE CITY. RICHMOND HOSPITAL CANNOT SERVICE THE COMMUNITY AS IT IS - DON'T BE SO GREEDY.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;

- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- **Saw poster in City facility**

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5N7

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**156**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:14 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

1. Railway needs to be widened to accommodate increased traffic - especially pullouts for buses. 2. Don't densify along arterials - use them for traffic movement.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)



[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

Do not increase traffic entering on arterials - use them for traffic movement.

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

DO NOT DEVELOP ALONG ARTERIALS

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13. Comments:**

No response

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

LANE HOUSING SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED!

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

No response

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

No response

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

No response

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

REFERRING TO ALL THE ABOVE UNFORTUNATELY RICHMOND'S BENT ON DENSIFICATION IS PUTTING "THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE" AS THERE HAS BEEN NO EFFORT TO PREPARE FOR DENSIFICATION I.E. TRAFFIC MOVEMENT, PARKING ETC. ARTERIAL ROADS SHOULD BE PRIMARILY USED FOR TRANSPORTATION AND NOT AS CORRIDORS FOR DENSIFICATION!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2Y9

**32. My Name is:**

Ralph Turner

### 33. My e-mail address is:

returner2@shaw.ca

# 157

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:16 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**158**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:18 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**



- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated**

## development requirements

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

## **20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

## **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

## **26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X XXX

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**159**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:27 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**

- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

Older population like fewer stairs.

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.  
The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

The "no lane" policy should be revoked. Lanes will clear up arterial roadways make it look like Williams between Shell & No. 5 Road.

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

Compact lots may increase affordability large lots become too expensive.

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

"Arterial Road Policy" is misleading. I thought it was about road improvements i.e. No Phone and Hydro Lines, No Driveways, No Garbage Collections on all Major Roads.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 5E7

**32. My Name is:**

Leo Mol

**33. My e-mail address is:**

Leosboks@hotmail.com

**160**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:33 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**



**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

With densification along arterial roads, SERIOUS consideration MUST be made on the impact of

heavier traffic to residents living along and around the arterial roads. Pollution and noise from the heavier traffic affects the quality of life and air and health (allergies, lead in air) of all residents. Innovative solutions should come from the City to make Richmond liveable and to maintain quality of life. Otherwise, it will become a heavy density city with POOR quality of life. Just don't tell me heavy traffic is inevitable, I can understand heavier traffic but best if you can come up with innovative ways to alleviate the impact!

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**161**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:36 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2.Comments:**

Try getting out of my driveway on No. 2 Road

## **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;

- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 3M1

**32. My Name is:**

John Cameron

**33. My e-mail address is:**

csbdnex@gmail.com

**162**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:39 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Richmond needs MUCH more densification.

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

No response

**7.Comments:**

Not if it reduces density.

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

It should be higher!

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

No response

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**



Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

No response

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

No response

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

No response

**24.Comments:**

No response

## **25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

No response

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

All arterials should have at least 4 level multiplex housing w/ lanes. Too many HUGE houses in Richmond pushing out middle-lower class families. Richmond is pandering to the wealthy. There needs to be a minimum amount of greenery and HUGE penalties for tree loss.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

# **163**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:42 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V7C 3L1

**32.My Name is:**

No response

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 164

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 10:44 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion



**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story

- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6T2

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

## 165

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 04:09 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

## proposed requirements

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

### 24. Comments:

No response

### 25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### 26.

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### 27. Comments:

No response

### 28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

1. Too much traffic with Townhouses so many people don't use garages and park on the roads. 2. When I bought my house I chose to buy in a residential area not a densified area. I like my space, yard and garden and privacy!

### 29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth

- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7A 2Z6

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

diziii@hotmail.com

## 166

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 09 May 2016, 04:18 PM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

No response

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**



## [See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **24. Comments:**

No response

### **25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

### **26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

## [See Board 12](#)

## [See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **27. Comments:**

No response

### **28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

As an owner/resident on a "Single-Family Lot Size Policy", I disagree with this policy established in 1989 where a lot of families who agreed on this policy have moved out of the area and/or not living on arterial road. Our family have lived at the present site over 24 years and our son has moved out of the house, and we do not agree with this antiquated policy. By allowing smaller, affordable housings for young families we can do away with "mega mansions" where many are using them for "illegal" suites or "motel rooming" houses whom possibly have evaded taxes on their rental income. Just within our block, please check out possible suites and/or rooms illegally rented at 4471, 4435, 4420 and 4411 which used to have a plate by the address as "Pro Design"...? Is the humongous house being built going to be used as "offices" or "motel"? P.S. I agree with Mark Sakai whose letter to the editor of Richmond News, "Large Lots Lead to Megahomes", mentioning this ??? (unreadable) policy

### **29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca

- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 1B6

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

ccteh@telus.net

## 167

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 09:26 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7. Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

## **14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

### **[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

## **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

### **[See Board 10](#)**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

### **[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

### **[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

## **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the**

**proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

No response

**31.My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32.My Name is:**

Harm Sjatu

**33.My e-mail address is:**

No response

**168**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 09:29 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)



- 
- **Yes**
  - No
  - No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

- **Newspaper story**
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7C 2G4

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

surinder@nhd.ca

**169**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 09:51 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **2. Comments:**

The policy area should also include Williams Road west of No 1 Road as it is served by a transit route.

## **3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

### **4.** **I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **5. Comments:**

No response

### **6.** **I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## **7. Comments:**

There are some purchasers who may be attracted to a smaller townhouse project with fewer owners.

### **8.** **Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 9. Comments:

The situation surrounding the subject site should be considered - if the SF lots have been redeveloped, they are likely already higher than pre-existing SF lots.

## 10. The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m

### [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

## 11. Comments:

Should be flexibility based on issues such as orientation, design, and nature of the SFD's.

## 12. The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m

### [See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- No
- **No Opinion**

## 13. Comments:

No response

## 14. Lane Network

Lane Network

## 15. I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction

### [Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

## 16. Comments:

There should be fewer restrictions on the location of new lanes.

## 17. Arterial Road Compact Lots

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19. Comments:**

No response

**20. I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21. Comments:**

Secondary suites should be allowed, in order allow a greater selection of house size options and opportunities for affordable housing.

**22. Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

Don't restrict locations and secondary suite provisions - encourage creativity and good urban design.

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

See comments for #9 above.

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

This policy which encourages more types and sizes of ground oriented housing is good. It makes housing more affordable and allows more options for people who want ground oriented housing! The current Lot Size Policy does not provide many options for ground oriented ownership aside from townhouses. This helps solve that problem.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- **Other**

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 6M6

**32. My Name is:**

Mark Sakai

**33. My e-mail address is:**

mark@gvhba.org

**170**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 09:54 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9. Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

No response

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No



- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Need more FAR Do not support the \$4.00 Affordable Housing should be less Have pre-zoning.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- **An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;**
- **A Richmond resident;**
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**

XXX XXX

**32. My Name is:**

Amar S. Sandhu

**33. My e-mail address is:**

sandhill9@hotmail.com

**171**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 09:58 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

Make it detailed up front, and easy to process, clear, fair, even requirements.

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

To be respectful of existing SF.

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**

- **No**
- No Opinion

**11. Comments:**

OK if doesn't impact density.

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13. Comments:**

No response

**14. Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**16. Comments:**

Do townhomes lanes are wasteful especially behind single family homes.

**17. Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

Great make clear requirements.

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Make things clear. Expedite complete applications.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);**
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- **LetsTalkRichmond.ca website**
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 2G2

**32. My Name is:**

No response

**33. My e-mail address is:**

No response

**172**

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 10:03 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

### **3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**  
**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**  
**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

#### **9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**  
**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**  
**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Please think about pre-zoning.

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- **An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road,**



etc. as shown on Board 1);

- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- **Newspaper advertisement**
- **City of Richmond website: richmond.ca**
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- **Facebook**
- Twitter
- Word of mouth
- Saw poster in City facility

**31.My postal code is (required):**

V6V 2T5

**32.My Name is:**

Satwant Atwal

**33.My e-mail address is:**

satatwal@hotmail.com

## 173

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 10:05 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

**[See Board 1](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2.Comments:**

No response

**3.Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.  
I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

[Board 8](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.  
I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

[See Board 10](#)

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 11](#)

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24.Comments:**

No response

**25.Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27.Comments:**

No response

**28.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

No response

**29.I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- **A Richmond resident;**
- A Richmond builder/developer;
- Other

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

- Newspaper story
- Newspaper advertisement
- City of Richmond website: richmond.ca
- LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
- Facebook
- Twitter
- **Word of mouth**
- Saw poster in City facility

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V7E 5B3

**32. My Name is:**

Robert Ethier

**33. My e-mail address is:**

rethier@shaw.ca

## 174

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 10:09 AM

**1.**  
**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**  
**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5.Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**  
**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

**[Board 8](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**16.Comments:**

No response

**17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

**18.**  
**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**21.Comments:**

No response

**22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

**23.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

[See Board 11](#)

[See Board 14](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**  
**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

All the new proposals seem good. However the time to rezone these projects can extend up to 1.5 years plus. Adding these new proposals, duplex, etc. it will take even longer. I recommend staff pre-zone these areas and only a DP application is required. Only Developers are willing to pay all associated fees to develop these sites, make it a PLA requirement.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

- An owner/resident of an arterial road property (i.e., a property fronting on an arterial road within the Arterial Road Policy area, such as No. 1 Road, Williams Road, etc. as shown on Board 1);
- An owner/resident of a property located adjacent to an arterial road property;
- A Richmond resident;
- **A Richmond builder/developer;**
- Other

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**



V6V 2T5

**32. My Name is:**

Ajit Thaliwal

**33. My e-mail address is:**

ajit@sutton.com

# 175

**Respondent Name :** Cathy S

---

Responded at 11 May 2016, 10:14 AM

**1.**

**I support the policy to encourage densification along certain arterial roads to accommodate the City's share of normal regional growth outside of the City Centre**

[See Board 1](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**2. Comments:**

No response

**3. Arterial Road Townhouses**

Arterial Road Townhouses

**4.**

**I support the proposed locations of townhouse development and the associated development requirements and design guidelines**

[See Board 5](#)

[See Board 6](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**5. Comments:**

No response

**6.**

**I support the proposal to allow more flexibility on minimum site assembly on designated townhouse blocks with newer homes and narrower lots**

[See Board 5](#)

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

**7.Comments:**

No response

**8.**

**Townhouse building height should be limited to 2 storeys along rear yards next to single family lots**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**9.Comments:**

No response

**10.**

**The minimum second storey setback for townhouses along rear yards, next to single family lots, should be at least 6.0 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**11.Comments:**

No response

**12.**

**The minimum ground floor setback along rear yards next to single family lots should be at least 4.5 m**

[See Board 6](#)

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

**13.Comments:**

No response

**14.Lane Network**

Lane Network

**15.**

**I support the proposed lane network for compact lots and support a new strategy to facilitate lane construction**

## **Board 8**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **16.Comments:**

No response

### **17.Arterial Road Compact Lots**

Arterial Road Compact Lots

### **18.**

**I support the proposed locations of compact lot development and the associated development requirements**

**[See Board 10](#)**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No
- No Opinion

### **19.Comments:**

No response

**20.I support the concept of Compact Lot Duplexes and the proposed requirements >**

**[See Board 11](#)**

- Yes
- **No**
- No Opinion

### **21.Comments:**

No response

### **22.Arterial Road Rowhouses**

Arterial Road Rowhouses

### **23.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of row house development and the proposed requirements**

**[See Board 11](#)**

**[See Board 14](#)**

- **Yes**
- No

- No Opinion

**24. Comments:**

No response

**25. Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes**

Arterial Road Duplexes/Triplexes

**26.**

**I support the concept and proposed locations of arterial road duplexes/triplexes and the proposed requirements >**

[See Board 12](#)

[See Board 13](#)

- Yes
- No
- No Opinion

**27. Comments:**

No response

**28. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Have Arterial Road Policy for at least 20 years. Bad example of Williams from No. 4 Road to No. 5 Road. Changed 4 times in last 15 years.

**29. I am interested in the Arterial Road Policy Update as I am: (check all that apply)**

No response

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

No response

**31. My postal code is (required):**

V6X 2N6

**32. My Name is:**

Benn Panesar

**33. My e-mail address is:**

bpanesar@sutton.com