


Project Report


16 January 2017 - 07 March 2017

Lets Talk Richmond

Proposed single family dwelling building massing regulations



Visitors Summary




Highlights

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| TOTAL VISITS | MAX VISITORS PER DAY | |
| 2.7 k | 242 | |
| NEW REGISTRATIONS | | |
| 289 | | |
| ENGAGED VISITORS | INFORMED VISITORS | AWARE VISITORS |
| 635 | 1.4 k | 2.2 k |

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

ENGAGEMENT TOOLS SUMMARY



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

INFORMATION WIDGET SUMMARY



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


ENGAGEMENT TOOL: SURVEY TOOL

Tool title/name: Building Massing 2017

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


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

Optional question




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

Optional question



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


Optional question



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

Optional question


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



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


I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall...

Optional question




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

Optional question



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

Optional question




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

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


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

Optional question




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

Optional question




If yes, my preferred option is:

Optional question




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

Optional question




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

Optional question



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

Optional question




Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped: 104 (23.8%)

Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped: 333 (76.2%)


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

Optional question




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

Optional question




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

Optional question




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

Optional question




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

Optional question



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

Optional question



Konkin, Barry

Subject: FW: housing controls

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, 13 November 2016 15:27

To: Mayor and Councillors

Subject: housing controls

To all concerned:

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Browse my new website: <http://members.shaw.ca/seiche>

Konkin, Barry

Subject: FW: I LOST MY SUNSHINE

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

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



Konkin, Barry

Subject: FW: Housing Controls

From: Mayor and Councillors
Sent: Friday, 18 November 2016 10:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Housing Controls

Dear [REDACTED]

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

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

Regards,

Claudia

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 17 November 2016 13:28
To: Mayor and Councillors
Subject: Housing Controls

Dear Mayor Brodie and City of Richmond Councillors,

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

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

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

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

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

I petition you to

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

Respectfully yours,



Konkin, Barry

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

From: Mayor and Councillors

Sent: Friday, 18 November 2016 14:56

To: [REDACTED]

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

Dear [REDACTED],

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

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

Regards,

Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: cjesson@richmond.ca

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, 16 November 2016 22:21

To: Mayor and Councillors

Subject: 2nd round of amendments to building by laws

Dear councillors,

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

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

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

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

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

what happen to the street appeal?

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

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

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

Please rescue Richmond

Thanks

Konkin, Barry

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

From: Mayor and Councillors

Sent: Monday, 21 November 2016 08:49

To: [REDACTED]

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

Dear [REDACTED],

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

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

Regards,
Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: cjesson@richmond.ca

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, 19 November 2016 13:37

To: Mayor and Councillors [REDACTED]

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

Dear Mayor and Council:

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

Over 100 people or 98% of the neighbours have already signed a petition against Monster and Oversized houses in our neighbourhood. This was presented to the Council in early September. We are therefore very surprised to hear that the Municipality of Richmond is meeting on November 22 2016 (Richmond Planning Committee Meeting) to discuss regulating oversized houses. Do not open the door to oversized houses as they add nothing to the neighbourhood. They destroy the ambience of a neighbourhood; and the sense of community is fractured because they don't fit in. They stick out like a small hotel. Richmond is supposed to be known as a friendly municipality but it is losing that distinction, as it allows this type of development to occur without any regard to the wishes of the community. It seems as though the developers have the ear of the

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

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

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

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

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

There is also a possibility that these oversized houses could become Airbnb which would be a disaster for Richmond neighbourhoods and could easily spring up if oversized house are allowed. That would just destroy the character of the neighbourhood. Many stories have been written in the papers about these Airbnb places with all night parties, car all over the place, garbage left all over the place. We don't want them and I could see that kind of rental happening. We are close to the airport which is a perfect location for an Airbnb

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

ZoomBookmarkSharePrintListenTranslate

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

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

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

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

Mayor and council

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

COUNCIL NOTE THE STATEMENT BELOW AND TAKE HEED.

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

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

Large turnout expected for West Van byelection 3

ZoomBookmarkSharePrintListenTranslate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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



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

From: [REDACTED]

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

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

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

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


Hello Planning Committee members,

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

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

Your efforts are appreciated.

[REDACTED]



Konkin, Barry

Subject: FW: Tree protection and building envelopes

From: MayorandCouncillors

Sent: Tuesday, 22 November 2016 11:53

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Tree protection and building envelopes

Dear Mr. Guthrie,

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

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

Regards,
Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: cjesson@richmond.ca

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, 21 November 2016 14:16

To: MayorandCouncillors

Subject: Tree protection and building envelopes

Hello Mr. Mayor and Councillors:

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

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

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

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Konkin, Barry

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

From: MayorandCouncillors

Sent: Wednesday, 23 November 2016 08:34

To: [REDACTED]

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

Dear [REDACTED],

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

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

Regards,
Claudia

Claudia Jesson

Manager, Legislative Services

City Clerk's Office

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

Phone: 604-276-4006 | Email: cjesson@richmond.ca

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, 22 November 2016 15:09

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

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

Honorable Mayor, council and staff,

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

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

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

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

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

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

I am neither against developers not against development, I only stand against mindless building practices whose real costs are being invisibly passed onto neighbors , the community and as I have tried to explain in my letter, to the earth.

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

reduce the excesses of massive home building on single family lots. They have also wisely protected the small lots (less than 28 m deep and less than 372 m²) from any negative impact from increased regulatory bylaws related to setbacks. However, I also noticed that in each case the staff has also left a “status quo” option for the council, in case you decide not to do anything about an issue.

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

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Brodie, Malcolm

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

Importance: High

Dear Mayor Brodie and City Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Maximum length/setbacks/site coverage

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

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

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

Restricting Garage Capacity and Increasing Gate Setbacks

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,



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

Konkin, Barry

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

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

Hi Mr Cooper,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards and best wishes,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.

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

From: donotreply@richmond.ca [mailto:donotreply@richmond.ca]

Sent: Friday, 10 February 2017 16:14

To: InfoCentre

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



Attention: Administrator

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

General Comments, Compliments and Questions

Category: Comment

Comment/Compliment/Question:

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

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

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

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



Tech Information:

Submitted By: 199.175.130.61

Submitted On: Feb 10, 2017 04:13 PM

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

Konkin, Barry

Subject: FW: Zoning Changes

From: MayorandCouncillors
Sent: Tuesday, 14 February 2017 09:08
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Zoning Changes

Dear [REDACTED],

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

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

Sincerely,

Claudia

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

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 10 February 2017 17:44
To: MayorandCouncillors
Subject: Zoning Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration and thoughtful process.

Regards,



Survey Responses

01 January 2017 - 30 March 2017

Building Massing 2017

Lets Talk Richmond

Project: Proposed single family dwelling building massing regulations



VISITORS
1622

CONTRIBUTORS

635

RESPONSES

796

635

Registered

0

Unverified

0

Anonymous

796

Registered

0

Unverified

0

Anonymous



Respondent No: 1

Login: Jack

Responded Jan 18, 2017 13:52:04 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 2

Login: Sukh N

Responded Jan 18, 2017 19:56:50 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 3

Login: Rooting for a liveable
city

Responded Jan 18, 2017 22:15:57 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

Yes

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

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

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

Yes

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

Detached buildings footprint should be included in the square footage of the main home.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.**

Yes

| | |
|--|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| Side yard projections should not be allowed to encroach on the minimum side yard setback. With modern energy efficient heating, chimney stacks are no longer required, even for fireplaces. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| Hard surface should be reduced further. 20% of lot is far too great, especially when the area between the side lot line and building face is excluded from the calculation of minimum landscaped area. Far too much area is dedicated to accommodating vehicles. There should also be a strict minimum on non-permeable hard surface... and this should be tested for a minimum level of permeability. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

I propose that the number of trees should be set based on the area of the lot, with a minimum of two large trees. For larger lots, one of the trees should be an evergreen tree. All trees should be native trees to encourage habitat for songbirds (note: BC has experienced a 35-45% declined in songbirds due to loss of habitat. Vancouver has a bird strategy - <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/vancouver-bird-strategy.pdf> - Maybe it's time for Richmond to do the same.)

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. Yes

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

Landscaping need to have a certain density of plants and trees. Too many lots have far too much bark mulch and small trees to be considered landscaped. My observation is that builders request low maintenance landscaping to facilitate absentee owners or owners who don't want landscaping.

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

I also propose eliminating walls. Walls started showing up around the time we started to get large number of foreign owners. Many of the foreign owners came from countries where security was a concern and walls and in some cases razorwire was required to protect your family and home. This was not the case in Canada and unfortunately we have allowed this cultural fear to define our neighbourhoods, effectively sending the message that "you are not welcome here". So much for supporting neighbourhood community.

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. Yes

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

For a city that says that it is environmentally sensitive, it is incongruous to allow multiple car garages. Time to move forward from a car-centric culture to a mass-transit/pedestrian-friendly culture.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

Homes built in the past few years tower above the older homes. Are we getting to the point where building height is a status symbol, the way it was in the middle-ages where wealthy families built tall towers (e.g. San Gimignano in Italy)?

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I applaud the work of the staff for having the courage to try to deal with the current concerns of the residents, and for starting to look at the holistic development of the lot and impact on the neighbourhood, not just the parameters of the building. The crazy greed of the real estate market has resulted in homes becoming investment commodities and builders constructing houses for profit and not to enhance a neighbourhood and develop community. You are behind the curve and trying to catch up. It will take a lot more courage and imagination to get to a point where the city is viewed as truly progressive. I heard many times during the Open House at Southarm that the city has to balance the needs of the builders and residents. Maybe you need to weigh the long-term investment of the two stakeholders in favour of the resident... who will be living in the neighbourhood long after the builders have moved away. Residents live in neighbourhoods made up of a collection of homes and we look at our neighbourhood holistically.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 4

Login: Amit Dhingra

Responded Jan 19, 2017 10:26:16 am

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

i do not believe it makes sense for a lot that is 100 ft long to have to be more than 20ft set back. I understand if a lot is 150 ft long that 20ft is not enough but to take more than 20% on a smaller lot does not make much sense to me.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments this rule may provide privacy to one neighbor but it will not do the same for the house next door. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

yes only dependent on the size of tree that has to be planted.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

this would reduce the amount of driveway space that is available for parking cars. I live on seacote road and this street has no sidewalks and the street is marked as a school path so you cannot park cars on the street from 8am-5pm. we have 4 cars in our house hold, where are we expected to park if we do not have enough driveway space? If the city is willing to build sidewalks on all streets (ideal) then this might make more sense.

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

the amount of crime has increased in Richmond over recent years. Twice when we have left our gate open we have had our cars broken into. i think the current bylaw is fine.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

not answered

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story



Respondent No: 5

Login: Rosemary

Responded Jan 19, 2017 11:54:34 am

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

Yes

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

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

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

Yes

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.**

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Approval of these amendments will go a long way to eliminating the problems I've seen developing in Richmond over the last 10 years. I think they will enhance neighbourhood good will and liveability. Please do not fold to developer pressure. Also, please do followup to ensure that, for example, the 2 trees aren't chopped down a year after being planted, or the back yard covered in interlocking bricks.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

**Respondent No:** 6**Login:** Diljit**Responded** Jan 19, 2017 12:41:06 pm**At:**

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

Not very practical when the proposed change is applied to narrow and long lots. This change can be implemented with some further provisions and restrictions, exemptions for longer lot sizes.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

20ft rear yard space is adequate

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

Yes

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

again this can be implemented ONLY if there are exemptions for side road lots. This can be applied ONLY to lots facing the main roads, where there is a safety concern.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 7
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 12:43:51 pm
At:
Last Seen: May 11, 2017 17:25:47 pm

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 8
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 12:47:11 pm
At:

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: {ENOUGH] Stop this nonsense. | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: 2015 Bylaw | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 9
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 12:53:30 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 10

Login: Cathy S

Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 12:55:37 pm

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 11
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 12:57:53 pm

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Existing Bylaws are already with lots of restrictions.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 12
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 13:00:15 pm

At:



Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

No change.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: No change | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments No change | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: No change | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: No change | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: No change | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No change | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: No change | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: No change | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 13
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:02:06 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
No change, existing Bylaw is good.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 14

Login: rmdplan2014

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:05:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see **Board 9 below**) Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections

Q15.**Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q16.**Comments:**

not answered

Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. Yes

Q18.**Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards** not answered

Q19.**Comments**

not answered

Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. Yes

Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: not answered

Q22.**Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping** not answered

Q23.**Comments:**

not answered

Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. Yes

Q25.**Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits** not answered

Q26.**Comments:**

I wonder what is classified as a tree... A palm tree or Japanese Maple OK?

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I would prefer if all entry gates be banned on newly constructed homes. They are a barrier to mail delivery and shuts out the neighbors. And they are useless in terms of security away. Just ornamental bullshit. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Hope this takes into consideration some flat- rooved homes which seem unusually tall. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I would like new home owners to plant trees tall enough to bring shade and nesting for birds ex. birch, elm, maple.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 15
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:06:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
This will limit the flexibility in space planning and affect the overall exterior design.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
I don't see the need for accessory buildings.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: There is enough yard space. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

All these amendments will only constrict the designs of homes to make cookie cutter neighbourhoods without contribution to aesthetic or function.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
Word of mouth
Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 16
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:09:37 pm

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Developers are already planting many trees on new homes. |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It is a genuine trend that the houses made under the current bylaw are not as appealing as the ones that preceded. Now you are suggesting that we go even further. Buyers who are investing millions of dollars into this city deserve to build their dream home. Thank you.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 17

Login: Cathy S

Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:11:09 pm

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 18
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:19:41 pm

At:



- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I strongly believe that the current zoning regulations are very sufficient in the way they function. The depth of homes, front/rear and sideyard setbacks are set based on a societal norm; access Metro Vancouver the setbacks around a home are standard, any deviation from this is unnecessary and unneeded. Furthermore, I believe direction of rear and side yard decks should be to the discretion of the home owner/designer. When it comes to landscaping, the current bylaw is working well. Trees that are removed are being replaced, and trees that are not moved during construction are protected thoroughly.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 19
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 19, 2017 14:22:54 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

No change, existing Bylaw is good.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| more coverage is better for | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| No change, existing Bylaw if can be more reasonable. | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is OK. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is OK for security. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: 2 car garage should be good. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: No change, existing Bylaw is good. | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 20

Login: dor

Responded Jan 19, 2017 15:14:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 21

Login: Susan

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:16:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 22

Login:

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:23:34 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 23

Login: ValerieA

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:25:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 24

Login: rram

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:28:48 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 25

Login: 41Tazewell

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:31:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
We need more open space around houses.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
no comments.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 26

Login: renneberg

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:32:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 27

Login: survey

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:37:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 28

Login: Marmaduke

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:40:11 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

We need to preserve open space for appearance, health (trees and greenery to clean the air, provide homes and food for bird life and help as much as possible to prevent climate change

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

Yes

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

Very important to keep space here - for all above reasons.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

Yes

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

Important if there is to be any sense of neighbourhood.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Important for some privacy. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Landscaping is essential for appearance, birdlife, drainage, cleaning the air and gneral well-being of all. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Trees are important

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

important for appearance and drainage

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Needed for safety and neighbourliness

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Important for appearance and neighborliness

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Neighbourhoods need a consistency.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond needs to try to keep a sense of *being* Richmond and not just anywhere.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 29

Login:

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:40:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 30

Login: SGP

Responded Jan 19, 2017 16:41:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Current requirements are fine.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | More trees should be mandated. Four or more would be better. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 31

Login: ajstotts

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:01:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | As the Houses get larger in Richmond, Overlook is real concern |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | I think that landscaping is a persons choice if they own a fee simple freehold lot in Richmond. If they want a world class garden or 3 old cars on pavement a fridge and a weightbench outside; it is up to them. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Front entry gates do cause congestion and accidents on Westminster HWY. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 32

Login: Les

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:13:18 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

One aspect of a garden and the tree you want planted, no one trims them. We are moving from Richmond, having spent 33+ years in the same house because we no longer have a vegtable garden due to the large tree on the north side of Applegreen apartments.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

There is no need to change the setback, people today do not want to deal with a garden. People want a large house and a fence!

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: People want a large house and a fence! | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

No if they are not forced to trim the trees every year it is a waste of time.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

People do not spend their time in their yard!

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

A gate is a gate separating the public area of the street from my property. It has always been the border. We do not all live on 5 acres!

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

This sounds very much like an exercise in green without thinking of the resident of Richmond. The city can cut down or plant any tree anywhere, the public must pay fees so that you may grant permission to do the same!

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.Please specify:

In what will affect the sale of my house so that I may retire!

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 33

Login: Snowy

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:21:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 34

Login: Brent

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:26:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 35

Login: licorise

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:29:13 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Home owners on number two road frequently hold up traffic waiting for their gate to open, they just sit there, with no consideration for others. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It's time that the city started listening to the tax payers of the community and not the developers who have had complete run for years.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 36

Login: Richmond70

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:36:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 37

Login: Zepple

Responded Jan 19, 2017 17:52:56 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Especially along arterial roads it is important that the vehicle leaving the roadway has a place to wait while the gate opens rather than blocking traffic. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 38

Login: Mumof3

Responded Jan 19, 2017 18:33:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 39

Login: nature first

Responded Jan 19, 2017 18:50:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 40

Login: Teresa

Responded Jan 19, 2017 18:54:12 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | The Tree Bylaw needs to be updated. There needs to be many more than two trees planted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 41

Login: systarke

Responded Jan 19, 2017 19:09:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 42

Login: railroad

Responded Jan 19, 2017 20:12:46 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 43

Login: Aquifer

Responded Jan 19, 2017 20:52:06 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Thank you for your work on this important topic. We need to preserve the character of Richmond; reasonable house sizes, not megahouses; green spaces and not concrete/asphalt. We need to think long term and preserve as has been done in many other cities.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Richmond home garden areas have been paved over and we need to keep our domestic green spaces. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Very well thought out Bylaw!

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

This would go a long way towards improving the appearance of our neighbourhoods.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

This is what we need to prevent the "walled camp" look.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please use these Bylaws to keep our city green and stop the walled in compound look. I am a long term Richmond resident and congratulate the people who initiated and carried through this Bylaw process.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 44

Login: Brandt

Responded Jan 19, 2017 21:32:29 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I have seen a few cities in USA, where no fence is allowed, only trees are planted in front and back yard, so neighbors really get to each and kids are playing in a BIG yard, firemen have great access to fight fire, because no fences in between.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Let us have as much green space as possible.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Green space please. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

As many trees as possible.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

I do not want to see the front yard to become cement parking lot, bad for the environment .

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

We live in free country, what to be afraid of, unless you are a thief, or have too much illicit money and proceeds in your house.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I want to encourage the city to make sure that we will have more green space.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 45

Login: ArkaSa

Responded Jan 19, 2017 22:16:42 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Twitter



Respondent No: 46

Login: lola

Responded Jan 19, 2017 22:50:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Consider changing the definition of 'Single Family' to reflect the reality that many many homes house one or more secondary suites as well. Single Family homes are actually businesses these days.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 47

Login: LMA

Responded Jan 19, 2017 23:14:35 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

not answered

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Too many disproportionately big houses in Richmond! If you want a giant house...you need to be able to afford a bigger lot! Too much house, not enough greenspace!

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Preserve privacy and breathing room in our backyards!

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: not answered | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE pass this! I am SO SICK of concrete "yards". | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Preserve Richmond's greenery!!!

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

Some people just completely pave their front yards to park their cars! That's what garages are for! Maybe if you have too many cars and no space to park them...you either have too many drivers living in your cramped house, or you have too many cars. Neither is good for the environment. Please stop this!

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Do you build the gates to "protect" your house because...you actually aren't here most of the time? Or are you scared of your neighbours? Either way...the Richmond I grew up in, wasn't like this. Let's foster a sense of community and get rid of the gates. This isn't like other parts of the world where people live in COMPOUNDS. We live in NEIGHBOURHOODS!!!

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

YES! I HATE those houses! I see this all the time, where I live in Steveston Village...where the lot is RAISED! How is this legal?! This is HORRIBLE! Then a monster tall house is built, COMPLETELY OVERSHADOWING & DE-VALUING neighbouring properties. WHY DOES THE CITY PERMIT THIS? The poor neighbours get all the monster house water draining and flooding their property. On top of their yards and windows all being forced to darkness and shade. SOOOO WRONG!!!

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 48

Responded Jan 19, 2017 23:28:56 pm

Login:

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
x
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 49

Login:

Responded Jan 20, 2017 04:54:43 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

We need more room for green to help with air exchange, cooling and water absorption. More green allows more room for play, gardens and trees - all good for family life and the environment and energy conservation.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

See previous comment. More setback means less overwhelming neighbours and shadowing.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

See preceding

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Limits are limits. We've had enough whittling away of them of the over the years. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments If previous amendments go through with more limits for house size, I have no problem with a deck reaching the outer wall of the house, in fact, I think option 2 looks odd. I do have concerns about decks running all along or around a house or greater portion thereof. As if they usually get much use anyway. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Previous comments still apply. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| Yea for trees - they cool, moisturise, absorb CO2 and make O2, not to mention provide shade and recycle nutrients in the form of leaves if deciduous as well as provide haven for birds. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| No need to be too restrictive. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| I think setting the gate so far back interferes with front landscaping. I have problems with stone, brick & mortar walls in front and walls and gates that are too high and un-neighbourly. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| We need to discourage cars. | |

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

not answered

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 50

Login: lowla

Responded Jan 20, 2017 07:56:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am happy that the city is finally doing something about the ugly monster houses going up everyday in Richmond.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 51

Login: Saffron

Responded Jan 20, 2017 07:57:22 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 52

Login: Doyland

Responded Jan 20, 2017 10:49:20 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Twitter



Respondent No: 53
Login: I love Richmond

Responded Jan 20, 2017 12:00:59 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I propose the total prohibition of front entry gates for houses along all main roads. I always travel via Francis Road and discovered that there are many new houses having a front gate in these two years, resulting in unnecessary traffic congestion during busy hours, when the cars just stand still suddenly in the middle of Francis Road to wait for their gates to open!!! This cause massive and unnecessary block up of traffic, and is very dangerous to do so. If the proposed setback of front entry gate regulation is passed, it would definitely help the situation a lot, as they can at least wait on the sidewalk/setback area for their gates to open, instead of stopping dead in the middle of a busy road. As for the existing 'problematic' gated houses, is there any possibility for the council to restrict them to keep their gates opened until at least, like, 8pm everyday, when all the busy traffic hours have past? | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

not answered

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 54

Login: Dimanax

Responded Jan 20, 2017 12:03:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 55

Login: CJ

Responded Jan 20, 2017 12:16:48 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I assume/hope this doesn't apply to SFD on ALR, that there is some additional size restrictions on those houses.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 56

Responded Jan 20, 2017 13:07:10 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
To allow space for front and rear yard
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
To ensure bigger lots have rear yard of proportionate sizes
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
To ensure space is enough between houses and yards
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| | To have some control over projections, but prevent things getting out of hand while people go wild in having projections everywhere |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| | Privacy concern |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| | Gardening is a hobby, not a rule |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| | Gardening is a hobby, not a rule |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: More greenery is good | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Don't like mega big house with maximum security, like a prison | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

There should be a balance between people's preference, convenience and overall appearance. If everyone is sensible, reasonable and considerate, perhaps none of these changes will be required. Richmond is turning into a crowded place, and we're struggling for more housing. I hope that we don't need to compromise quality of life with the demand for more housing; I hope that the mega house won't be turned into hotel with no control; I hope that our neighbourhood has people, green space, plant, parking, and more, everything with an appropriately balanced system.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 57

Login: angcar

Responded Jan 20, 2017 16:12:00 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Where is the maximum allowable house size. This is the problem you should be working on. No more 22,000 sq.ft 17 bedroom homes. You should use the same rules as Delta.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No Opinion

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

This survey is way too complicated. You would need to be a builder to understand it. You know what the problem is...you have allowed building sizes to go unchecked and have created a disaster in Richmond neighborhoods and in our agricultural lands. We are being taken advantage of by off shore interests. If the Globe and Mail can figure out what the problem is, why can't you just use common sense and fix it? There are so many "ugly" and "giant" homes here now. You are responsible for cleaning up this mess.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 58

Login: Helmut

Responded Jan 20, 2017 16:33:01 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 59
Login: ShellmontOne

Responded Jan 20, 2017 17:35:58 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 60

Login: nicolewc

Responded Jan 20, 2017 18:48:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 61

Responded Jan 20, 2017 20:32:18 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | not answered |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Allow the residents living by narrow lane and land width only 40 m to build a 3 story house. The first floor is a four-car garage. the second floor is living room, family room and kitchen, the third floor is bedrooms. Nowaday every my neighbors had 3 cars each family and they parked both sides of narrow lane. You have to drive like snake. The parking limit sign was removed many years ago and had never been replaced.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 62

Login: bytown

Responded Jan 21, 2017 09:49:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 63

Login: pacspro

Responded Jan 21, 2017 11:17:06 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 64

Login: hanxxx

Responded Jan 21, 2017 11:59:01 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No Opinion
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 65

Login: valgal

Responded Jan 21, 2017 14:23:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 66
Login: richmond50years

Responded Jan 21, 2017 21:49:00 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No Opinion
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | I challenge the exception, and would establish a minimum requirement that ensures "trees" does not include "plants" or shrubs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond, my home for 50+ years, promotes itself as the "Island City by Nature" and I take great pride in that. On my short street, 1/4 of the houses have recently been demolished and replaced by mega homes. I have watched perfectly healthy trees and shrubbery bulldozed and replaced by concrete driveways and gates. This is NOT conducive to a green city and affects our overall quality of life here. We do NOT need hotel like housing, especially in a time where affordable housing is so desperately needed for future generations. This is not the vision shared by the community (or promised to us by the powers that be).

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Facebook Word of mouth |
|--|---------------------------|



Respondent No: 67

Login: jeeg

Responded Jan 22, 2017 10:59:53 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No Opinion
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 68

Login: Laula

Responded Jan 22, 2017 12:06:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 69

Login: DebT

Responded Jan 22, 2017 12:33:58 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Allowing houses to be built so close to an existing house or tower over existing homes decreases the quality of life for those in the older homes. It creates large shadows that affect gardens and promotes mould and moss growth and affects gardens and natural light coming in to homes. It takes away privacy and increases the chance of damage if there is a fire in adjacent homes. Mature healthy trees are often taken down and not replaced again affecting neighbours and privacy. Allowing massive homes to be built in existing neighbourhoods changes the look and feel of the neighbourhood, usually not for the better.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 70

Login: lynde

Responded Jan 22, 2017 13:15:17 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Maximum length of wall does not address how this affects houses on lots narrower than 18 metres. On a typical lot in Steveston this would be devastating.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I could support a second floor setback of 7.5 metres but because the first floor setback includes covered areas, I do not support the amendment.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

The home owner building the accessory building ends up with less useable rear yard while the adjacent owner would notice only slightly less impact.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: I support option 2 only if it allows 3.0 metres in length on each floor on the same side of the house. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

I think you mean a "minimum" area of front yard landscaping for which I would support option 2.

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I support the 1.2 metre height but the 6.0 metre setback does not take into account the distance between the paved surface and the property line so I would support a 1.5 metre setback.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

For narrow lots there is no option but to place the garage in front of the house. This amendment only pertains to lots wider than 15 metres and deeper than 33 metres because smaller lots cannot support a three car garage. This amendment would mean three car garages would have to face the street which would result in houses looking like garages with houses attached. Is that what you want?

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

These amendments suggest that racism is the motive behind them. The changes pertain to housing elements popular with Asian buyers. Consider the source of the complaints and try to get a more diverse representation before making a decision.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Word of mouth



Respondent No: 71

Login: kelandtrev

Responded Jan 22, 2017 15:25:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
I think bringing accessory buildings further away from the rear property line will be better for the rear neighbor but worse for the side neighbor. in neighborhoods with alleys I think this is even more so.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 72

Responded Jan 22, 2017 16:21:06 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 73

Login: KI

Responded Jan 22, 2017 17:09:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Think it should be in keeping with original neighbourhood houses depth.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 74

Login: azee

Responded Jan 22, 2017 17:48:23 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Option 4: look at other municipalities...Richmond has the worst bylaws. Council has no vision or understanding of what constitutes a neighbourhood. The builders rule the day-and the citizens watch as their sustainable and livable neighbourhoods become enclosed concrete enclaves

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Option 4: More outrage here...absolutely disgusting parameters. Why are these houses being built to be able to look right into someone else's yard/house. Gone are the trees, gone are the birds, gone is the privacy, gone are neighbourly neighborhoods. Builders making big \$\$ can not be the only criteria...shameful...lack of vision

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: not answered | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Words can not describe the outrage I see outside my window everyday. All I see is greed-destruction of privacy, of trees that once provided that privacy and places for birds etc-all gone for what?! No harmony in a neighbourhood but greediness that this councils has allowed way too long to happen | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Nary a tree, bush, shrub, flower... On one of the richest soils in the lower mainland-I live by a sea of paving stones and wrought iron & brick enclosures | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| Take down a mature tree- put up a comparable tree. I have seen 'twigs' being planted in front of oversized 'mausoleums' Truly heart breaking | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: | |
| Paving stones are NOT an alternative to real nature landscaping | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: | |
| Bizarre concept. Why are these in place who are they suppose to keep in / keep out. Creating ugly friendly-less neighbourhoods | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| More over consumption | |

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Too little too late-council should be a shame-asleep at the wheel-truly have been run over by the builders Richmond has becoming a 'hodge-podge' of unattractive home styles and designs PLEASE look to Vancouver for appropriate bylaws PLEASE find vision..so many wonderful things COULD have happened. We could of been LEADERS in creating a sustainable green city..

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: A Richmond resident
(check all that apply)

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):
Newspaper story
Facebook
Twitter
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 75

Login: FrankY

Responded Jan 22, 2017 18:05:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Stop limiting people from what they can or can not do on their own land.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 76

Login: Viktor

Responded Jan 22, 2017 19:20:39 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

There is no reason for a dwelling to be so gigantic that illegal hotels can be ran inside. 1 family, 1 reasonable house

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

These are very good amendments. Thank you for your hard work

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook



Respondent No: 77

Login: mieke

Responded Jan 22, 2017 19:46:29 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I've got a brand new build next door. the house starts at the back of my house and almost fills the entire site line of my back yard. the house has been empty for a year.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
|--|------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 78

Login: mclaysmith

Responded Jan 22, 2017 20:33:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 79

Login: Mrsbstyli

Responded Jan 22, 2017 21:38:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 80

Login: Chalkie

Responded Jan 23, 2017 10:46:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | There are numerous cases at present where the contractor takes the fine for "inadvertently" cutting down trees in order to develop the lot. The fine should be tripled to stop this. |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: While I support this amendment it is to stop front yards from being made into parking lots. If the yard is tastefully landscaped not necessarily with live plants, I am in favour of that. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 81

Login: kathryn

Responded Jan 23, 2017 12:14:13 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The weird little jog is kind of silly to achieve 55 percent depth, what do I know. I think the rear yard set back of 25 percent lot depth will be good enough. Or some increase to the rear yard setback. If you take 55 percent of 120 =66. Currently they are maxing out to about 80, 20 in the front and 20 in the back on a 120 by 66 foot lot. this is significant... Good luck.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Sure, I like percent depth the best as it is the mosr aggressive. I am not sure how you are going to deal with pie shaped lots. I think you should take the percentage of the lesser of the lot depths. This would make a lot of people very happy.

Q10.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

Seems reasonable

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Projections are a safety hazard and I am guessing that they are not counted in the FAR either. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments GET A LIFE. this one is silly. If you increase the rear yard setback, the decks should be pushed back. I never see people on balconies. Reducing the width is reasonable. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: This is great!!! | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| This is a really good one | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| <hr/> | |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| I think this one will be really hard to achieve. Look at all the narrow lots in the city. What are going to do with 33ft wide lots that have a double garage? | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| This hopefully will get rid of them. The symbol of the Asian invasion. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| Some of the existing garages are way longer than 30 feet, this is okay...probably good for a 2 car garage when you need some space between the garage and the house. | |
| <hr/> | |

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

This one is dead easy.

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Please go physically inspect some houses before you make anymore changes.

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Word of mouth



Respondent No: 82

Login: jacqui-oh

Responded Jan 23, 2017 13:56:32 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

not answered

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Seriously, how are we supposed to see this diagram? I really wanted to take this survey but this has really made me mad that I am taking my time to respond to you and instead experience such frustration over understanding the options. Should I be using a Mac instead of a PC?

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

not answered

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

not answered

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below)

not answered

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements

not answered

Q30.Comments:

not answered

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.

not answered

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

not answered

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

not answered

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below)

not answered

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

not answered

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height

not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am floored that this is a City of Richmond document and you can't even see the images clearly. I am not able to complete this survey.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 83

Login: knowitsky

Responded Jan 23, 2017 14:25:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I also support approval of more coach homes or mini residences on properties to help with the rental crisis

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 84

Responded Jan 23, 2017 14:30:19 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Twitter



Respondent No: 85

Login: Richard

Responded Jan 23, 2017 18:58:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 86

Responded Jan 23, 2017 22:27:14 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 87

Login: Phule

Responded Jan 24, 2017 13:04:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Facebook



Respondent No: 88

Login: ROIDON

Responded Jan 24, 2017 18:21:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Planting is one thing but they must be maintained |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | They must not be allowed to die |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

All green spaces and trees are to be maintained properly and not just planted to conform to the bylaw as and then left to die

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story LetsTalkRichmond.ca website |
|--|--|



Respondent No: 89

Login: Terwilliger

Responded Jan 24, 2017 18:52:21 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I'm in favour of a maximum length of 50% of the lot for a two story house. If the house is a single story home then the home should be restricted by the current regulations. In other words there should be a coverage bonus for lower height homes and single story homes to encourage that type of construction.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

With the size and height of home in Richmond that are being constructed there is no privacy between two houses that back onto each other. A second story should be required to be set back at least 2-3 meters from the back wall of the house to allow privacy from overlooking windows.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

I live on a 40 X 100 ft. lot. My neighbours have large trees along the fence line on two sides. We are gardeners and have little or no sun in out yard. We had trees 25 years ago but they failed to flourish due to lack of light. If you require trees then make the requirement that they be located 3.5 - 4 meters from the property line so that they are not infringing on the space of their neighbours. As an aside I like trees and would like to have one in our yard but the giant birch behind us overhangs our yard by at least 20 ft and it was cut back a few years ago.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Great idea, now if you really want to get creative how about banning those walls that are surrounding many of the new homes. They separate the home from the rest of the neighbourhood. I also think they lead to a fringe of city property around many of the walls that nerver gets cut or looked after which makes the neighbourhood look a mess.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Then maybe a contractor or designer could get a bit creative and build something that is different from everything else.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We are in the process of having a new home designed for a lot we have in Richmond in the Edgemere area. We have replaced the first designer because there was an unwillingness to try to create something that is not a square box built to the maximum allowed and shoved back as far as possible on the lot. We are looking to build a home to live in as we grow older, not a giant house on a small lot with neighbours looking out of their windows into our yard and windows.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News |
|---|--|



Respondent No: 90

Responded Jan 24, 2017 20:42:28 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 91

Login: Roy

Responded Jan 24, 2017 21:12:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: While I appreciate that you cannot legislate taste and style..... practically speaking, the majority of gates I see in newer Richmond home sites are useless for security (seemingly, the intended purpose). As such, they are a waste of materials, of property and are unsightly. Frankly, I would rather see a bylaw that does not allow gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 92

Login: coppersky

Responded Jan 25, 2017 10:26:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 93

Login: marymargaret

Responded Jan 25, 2017 11:12:09 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

the height of the buildings, as well as the size of footprint, is what has led to problems of privacy, lack of light and the general negative effect on the liveability of neighbourhoods

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

being overlooked by large decks on the second floor has been identified as a problem for privacy of neighbours

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: the more landscaping the better for the look, liveability and general health of neighbours and neighbourhoods | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| entry gates and the paving of front yards are contributing to the limited green space, lack of trees and deteriorating liveability of neighbourhoods | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| the trend of 2 3 and 4 car garages projecting out and the paving of front yards contribute to the loss of green , space, trees and the liveability of neighbourhoods | |

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

reduce the building overheight standard to 12 feet!!

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Richmond has let the builders determine the "new" look and feel of its neighbourhoods with the huge 3 level homes, massive footprints including projected garages, walls, entry gates and paving of front yards, The liveability of neighbourhoods has been seriously affected . It is time to take back our neighbourhoods for the neighbours/residents before it is too late! Profit and greed have dictated the increase of unsightly, environmentally and socially detrimental new house building for too long!

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 94

Login: Theresa

Responded Jan 25, 2017 14:06:59 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Ranchers should have more % of total lot depth as they would not have windows looking into neighbouring lots.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I prefer to have more privacy.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments I prefer to have some privacy and not have neighbours looking into my yard and house. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Maybe only one tree, choose front or back. I currently live on a small lot and have no sun because of all the trees right beside our fence in our neighbours lots.

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

not answered

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

I actually prefer no entry gates! Many of the homes that have these gates don't look after the area outside the gates and leave the neighbourhood looking very messy. It also isn't very neighbourly. There is often old newspapers etc. stuffed into the gate as it can't be delivered to the door.

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Yes, yes, yes !!!!!

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story



Respondent No: 95

Login: JayJay

Responded Jan 25, 2017 14:25:51 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

When I build my new home one day, I don't want the back portion to look like a maze. I should be able to have a square footprint with which to work with. The jog is just looks ridiculous and doesn't achieve anything.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

20ft. seems a bit short and I may be ok with 22-24ft. However, 35ft is just way too much.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

If this is about privacy, then placing the building as close as possible to the fence offers the neighbours additional privacy due to the height of the acc. building.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Eliminating the projects will give the appearance that there is more space between homes. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments I think the city is going too far with this, what does one do if the rear yard offers a view. For example, my yard backs on to a golf course. I am not bothering anyone and should be able to have a large deck. Nonsense regulation. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: What is the current coverage. Will making the change really help? Just leave as is. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q26.**Comments:**

More trees the better, plus address privacy issue.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|--|---|
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q30.**Comments:**

Once trees mature it will add to the appeal of the building, hopefully.

| | |
|---|----|
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|---|----|

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|------------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.**Comments:**

Another nonsense amendment. Does the city staff not have anything else better to do? How are you going to turn the car? How is the wide gate suppose to open? Into the garage? Really?

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|---|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q37.**Comments:**

Keep the current projection, however, limit the height and make it non-living area.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
|--|------------|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Undecided and not sure how it will change much?

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Less changes are better than too many without good outcome.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 96

Responded Jan 26, 2017 06:00:16 am

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Option three should be available , limit depth to 40% of lot depth

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The Minimum set back should be 25% of the lot in all cases

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Accessory Building should be included in the total allowable sq footage of a lot which is determined when a house is built.

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: The side yard set backs should always allow for a wheel chair or wheel barrel to access the rear yard because in the event of a fire emergency crews need space . | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: These numbers are confusing, it would seem that option 1 at 42 % would allow for more green space but after reading option three and the details it appears that option 3 has more green space.. The point is more is better. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| Follow up after 1 and 2 years to ensure the trees have been maintained. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: | |
| Follow up after 1 and 2 years to ensure the green space has been retained. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: | |
| Garages that face the street would allow for more green space so the city should require front facing garages. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| If Garage faced the street the front yard would have more street appeal because this would allow for more green space and less concrete. | |

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: A Richmond resident
(check all that apply)

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): Newspaper story



Respondent No: 97

Responded Jan 26, 2017 09:35:39 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 98

Login: Judie

Responded Jan 26, 2017 15:36:00 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: For traffic safety, there must be a by-law requiring gate set-backs. Drivers should be able to safely turn into their driveway and stop their vehicle before fumbling around for their remote gate opener (not much unlike using a cell phone). This would also help to maintain a traffic flow. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: I think that three-car garages are for homes on acreage. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I also feel that a by-law needs to be looked at regarding grade differences between new builds which are pre-loaded and existing older homes. My next door neighbour pre-loaded the lot and built two new homes and now our backyard fence is built up about 3 feet higher than it was before, on 4 x4's, which don't even match the fence. The extra-high fence makes us feel like we are in jail and has added unwanted shade to our garden and yard.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 99

Responded Jan 26, 2017 16:34:32 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 100

Login: ruthless

Responded Jan 26, 2017 21:38:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Is it possible to require gates be see through instead of solid? Some houses are completely shut off from the street. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook



Respondent No: 101

Responded Jan 27, 2017 00:06:52 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 102

Login: jarrod

Responded Jan 27, 2017 18:52:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 103

Login: sierra

Responded Jan 27, 2017 19:42:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| Less paving with asphalt, cement, paving blocks and more water retentive coverings that support equalizing storm drainage and rainwater. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

All trees should be those indigenous to the area, NOT palm trees that survive a year or two and then disappear without replacements. If palm trees and other inappropriate trees are allowed, mandatory follow up by City staff should be diarized and replacements required if first plantings fail.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

We already have way too much cement, paving stones and asphalt. And people wonder why the temperature is rising...

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 104

Login: MDD

Responded Jan 27, 2017 21:18:59 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Yes, if homeowners don't want vegetation, they should consider apartment. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Yes, our neighbourhoods are turning into concrete jungles! | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Yes, some of the monster houses that are being built now look absolutely ridiculous in comparison to the other houses in the same neighbourhood. Things have really gotten out of hand. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 105

Login: Daysleeper

Responded Jan 27, 2017 22:17:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.**Please specify:**

Former resident. My parents still live there and I'd love to move back if there was more of a neighbourhood feel and young families could afford to live in those neighbourhoods.

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 106

Login: Julie 1/2n

Responded Jan 27, 2017 22:52:07 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I am fine with short front yards in order to provide larger, more useful back yards. I know we have worked to take cars off the road and on to driveways but, eventually, we will reduce the number of personal vehicles...let's start to plan for this now

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I support density on properly managed and designed multi-family properties while thinking that our single family homes need to be designed to maximize garden areas and tree canopies. In a world of reduce, recycle, reuse, I am staggered by those building ridiculously large homes, often covering almost all of the lot with buildings and hard surfaces.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Option 2 allows neighbours to retain a modicum of privacy | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

I expect you will need to specify tree types and/or sizes or people will meet the requirements but not the spirit of the regulation which is, I assume to increase tree canopy and create a greener landscape

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

The City may wish to make suggestions for xeriscape or other low water options and local options. Alternatives to grass would also be appreciated. I see many single home owners who have never had a yard or garden - I think they need help to understand what is expected, how much work it will be, what the attributes are...my neighbours are respectful and trusting of local government so I think this might work

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning No

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

It depends on whether the house faces the street or not. We see larger fences where homes have a rear or side yard along a roadway - in those cases a taller fence (1.2 m) or hedges are appropriate. But full fences with rolling gates across driveways to enclose the full frontage should be restricted to large properties, say over 1/2 acre. I am happy with full fences of a shorter height along the lot line of houses (and townhouses) as long as there is a gate to the street. I find the short fences on Ewen and English Avenues to be pleasant and effective when the home has a short front yard setback

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 107

Login: Wats

Responded Jan 28, 2017 09:42:08 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

You have severely eliminated green space in this city by allowing houses to take up entire lots along with the driveways that go along with them.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

It's a little late for this as the damage has been done.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Entry gates on main arteries create a traffic problem and also create an unfriendly atmosphere in the community. Neighbourhoods should be open, not look like fortresses.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Why wasn't this done sooner? Houses looming over their neighbours create a huge shadow and darken the houses next to them!

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond has lost its garden city status by the out of control development that has gone on. There has been no careful thought to developing neighbourhoods, only catering to developers wishes. So sad and the reason why young people no longer consider Richmond a lovely, open green area to raise a family. Now you are chipping away at our fertile farmland, losing the title garden city. For shame, city of Richmond! You sold out to the highest bidders!

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 108

Login: Cindy M

Responded Jan 28, 2017 11:39:31 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Front entry gates divide neighbourhoods. There is no surer way of saying, "I don't want to get to know my neighbours" than having a gated driveway. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 109

Responded Jan 28, 2017 11:41:52 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
In residential neighbourhoods maintain as much privacy as you can.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Again my concern is the privacy issue. I spend a lot of time in my back yard gardening and barbecuing. It is peaceful. I am not interested in hearing my neighbour on his cell phone or hearing his music hence my concern about privacy
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Again privacy concerns | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
|--|------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Every time I open the Richmond New there are people voicing their opposition to Monster Homes on Agricultural lands, Monster Homes in Residential Neighbourhoods and Airbnb yet the Municipal leaders are not listening to us. Infact to add insult to injury in the January 11 Richmond News A3 - MEGA HOMES DEBATE- "The City of Richmond invites the public to learn about and provide comments on options for updating the Richmond Zoning Bylaw to regulate single family residential development, to improve single family house design, house massing and landscaping" and they will be holding 6 open houses. -- It seems that the Council hasn't been listening to what we have been saying. WHAT AN INSULT Carol this issue on Mega homes has been debated so many times over the last 3 to 4 years in the newspapers - Richmond News, Vancouver Sun and Province and the Globe and Mail and 90% plus of the people are against MONSTER HOMES. The Mayor and Council have also received hundreds of letters OBJECTING TO MONSTER HOMES. And yet I am amazed that the Council is having open houses to update the Richmond zoning bylaw. In my neighborhood there was over 95% opposition when a DEVELOPER wanted to build a Monster Home. There is no need for more open houses or consultation the people of Richmond have spoken (look at all recent articles and letters in the January 11 and 17 2017 Richmond News Papers). I and others have written to the Council. We don't have time to waste at Open Houses. We have spoken. If the Mayor and Council don't heed our concerns then we will take action at the next Municipal Elections.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 110

Login: Barbara

Responded Jan 28, 2017 13:45:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 111

Login: Anon

Responded Jan 28, 2017 17:23:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 112

Login: LLim

Responded Jan 29, 2017 17:34:45 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Prefer Option 4: Limit house depth to 40-45% of lot. New houses are generally way too big with little or no green space/landscaping provided.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Prefer an even greater minimum setback (25-30ft) to increase rear yard green space.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

All accessory buildings should have minimum rear and side setbacks regardless of size as they may adversely affect neighbouring properties.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Decks should be set back an additional minimum of 10ft from rear yard setback and 5ft from side yard setback. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Prefer even less site coverage (ie 50%) allowing from more plantings and greener, friendlier neighbourhoods. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| Penalties are also needed for cutting down existing trees unnecessarily. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| <hr/> | |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| Prefer even more landscaping (70-80%) of front yard setback to bring back lost greenery. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Prefer lower maximum height (ie 3ft). Gates are OK for homes on major roads but should not be allowed/needed on residential streets. Homes with gates and fences and imposing facades are like fortresses - they discourage community interaction. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| <hr/> | |

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

not answered

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The size of new homes built in Richmond has generally become MUCH TOO large with little or no green space provided. These monster homes (some look more like office buildings) seem like imposing fortresses built to keep others out. Many are built with gates which also discourage interaction among neighbours. These types of homes do not foster community. They encourage isolation. If this trend continues the social fabric of neighbourhoods will deteriorate and Richmond will become a much less desirable place to live. Also the proliferation of homes with huge, imposing, multi-story entry columns is offensive. Let's ban those! They're HIDEOUS.

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story



Respondent No: 113

Login: PS

Responded Jan 29, 2017 17:52:53 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 114

Login: Resident

Responded Jan 30, 2017 11:27:10 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | The word 'Requirements' in the title 'Tree Planting Requirments' is misspelled (missing the 'e') |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Garages are often used for storage and freezers etc. There needs to be enough room to accommodate the car(s) and other areas. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 115

Login: tscholent1

Responded Jan 30, 2017 11:59:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Twitter



Respondent No: 116

Login: bh9999

Responded Jan 30, 2017 15:49:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 117

Login: Robyn

Responded Jan 30, 2017 19:20:51 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
the more open space the better I vote to limit size to smallest possible
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| i do not understand why you would allow projections | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| again keep some privacy | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 118

Login: via

Responded Jan 30, 2017 21:03:24 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I have a Lot that is wedge shaped. I'm uncertain how these amendments would affect me and others with non-rectangular shaped Lots.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: not answered | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Too much regulation. It should be the Owner's decision as to how much and what type of landscaping to plant. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Too much regulation. It should be the Owner's decision as to whether they choose to plant or cut down trees.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

Too much regulation. It should be at the Owner's discretion as to how they choose to landscape their property.

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I would support a minimum setback, because I understand that you would not want cars holding up traffic while waiting for the gate to open. However, I'm not sure about the reasoning for the maximum height requirement.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Definitely not. I believe this as well as most of the proposed amendments should be the Owner's decision. What is the benefit to to this proposed change and to who? Shouldn't the Owner be able to decide what is attractive whether it be grass or concrete?

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Yes, I believe that there should be a consistent and easily measurable method to measure building height.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Let's not over regulate what property owners can do with the houses that they build. Property owners should be able to decide building design and landscaping that they believe is beautiful, attractive and ultimately marketable. The setbacks etc. for buildings is far to complicated. The tree bylaw as it exists and as is proposed is not something that I can support. I want to decide what I plant and what I can cut down. I don't want municipal bylaws placing restrictions on what should be my decision.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Word of mouth



Respondent No: 119

Responded Jan 31, 2017 09:19:42 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 120

Login: jtallosi

Responded Jan 31, 2017 13:48:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 121
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:04:00 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gates. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Lona Wong

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 122
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:06:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Henry Wong My email address: starshenry@gmail.com

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 123
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:09:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gate. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Grace Wong

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 124
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:12:03 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: 9 m is still a bit high. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Henry Lee

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 125
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:15:11 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Maricris Navarro My email address is: navarromaricris73@yahoo.com

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 126
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:17:25 pm

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Ann Wong

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 127
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:19:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates please. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Karen Wbo

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 128
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:22:50 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% is better.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate is better in Richmond. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Karen Wong

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 129
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:26:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate is more suitable for Richmond we can all say HI to each other. Now the gated community is so cold and unwelcoming. Hardly KNOW the neighbours. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

My email address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 130
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Jan 31, 2017 14:28:51 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% would be better
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates is better | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Johnny Wong

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 131

Login: EdiT

Responded Jan 31, 2017 16:34:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 132

Login: kkr

Responded Jan 31, 2017 17:14:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 133

Responded Jan 31, 2017 20:03:59 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| No projections should be allowed. Even Option 3 is too close for fire hazards and lack of privacy. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Option 2 will offer more privacy for neighbours | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| The more space for landscaping and green living plant material the better. Now only 15% of some lots have green space despite the current bylaw. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

We must add regulations to specify that native trees must be planted and must be minimum size full trees, not dwarf trees. Also, for existing trees in the exception, they must be native, not tropical trees (e.g. not palms). Must be trees that will survive and contribute to the ecology.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I suggest we explore the possibility of eliminating the gates, concrete fences altogether. Although the set back might achieve this anyways. Look at what Surrey did.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

The smaller the projection the better. Large projections force the house to be more into the rear of the lot eliminating the privacy and sunlight in neighbouring backyards where we spend most of our time. Large projections also encourage more paving stoned area with no room for living plants.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: | not answered |
| Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | not answered |
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News Facebook Word of mouth |



Respondent No: 134

Login: polak

Responded Jan 31, 2017 21:02:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 135

Login: DustinP

Responded Jan 31, 2017 21:14:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 136

Login: hjhaj

Responded Jan 31, 2017 21:30:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 137

Login: Shan

Responded Jan 31, 2017 21:32:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 138

Login: shinolak

Responded Jan 31, 2017 21:36:34 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 139

Responded Jan 31, 2017 22:03:46 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I read about Richmond's rain water re-use project and know that unpaved/uncovered ground is very important for us. To have a long-lasting, good life here, we need a lot of green, open ground. Huge houses are not necessary; they are burdens for land. Like a human being, land needs to breathe and relax, too. When overly covered by all sorts of constructions, land will get sick and die, and so do the people living on the land.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 140

Responded Jan 31, 2017 23:02:18 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond has changed and will continue to change. I was born in this city and have seen this city change for the better from new infrastructure to new homes. Please don't listen to people that hate change.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 141

Login: rsharda

Responded Jan 31, 2017 23:39:36 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Having a small group of residents in Richmond influence the bylaw and ultimately dictate how we live is against the personal rights of many of the people who chose to call this city home.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 142

Login: P Glava

Responded Feb 01, 2017 03:04:17 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 143
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 09:29:14 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am a builder in Richmond. These recommended by-law changes (including those which took place last year) motivate me to come out and have my voice heard not because I am concerned about my bottom line - although I am, of course a profit mongering business man. I come out because I am passionate about my business, which is to build quality, well designed, thoughtfully planned, community oriented homes to the best of my ability. I'm not blind - I see the faults of other builders, and I understand, to a certain degree (I emphasize) the concerns of residents. However, these proposed by-law changes hinder my ability to build the best home possible (design, use of space, community oriented). The proposed by-law changes are extreme. The consideration of them being approved is to merely make a specific group of people happy - while leaving other tax paying, contributing to the economy residents in a grey area. Such decisions need to be made taking all residents into account, not only those who complain the loudest. I have deep concern for the future of this city. My name is: [REDACTED] My email address is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
Word of mouth
Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 144
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 09:37:22 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This can be regulated by front yard and rear yard setbacks. Forcing articulations may result in problems with internal layout or reduce energy efficiency.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Agree that making setback dependent on lot depth makes sense and also addresses house depth issue.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

More important to regulate Accessory Building height.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: If you require a side yard, there should be no projections except for minor (fireplace or vents). | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Micro management of design. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: More in line with other munis, without being too restrictive. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Especially in situations with large front side garages.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

Basically, if it's not house or required driveway it should be landscaped.

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I don't really see the point of this.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Already been done.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

To me the big issue is not massing, but the inability to subdivide large lots in most of Richmond's mature neighbourhoods. If subdivision were allowed, many of the complaints that residents have about the new houses would be eliminated, with the added benefit of: - improved affordability - more young families moving in - more enrolment in local schools - more neighbourhood vitality - fewer empty houses This should be the next major policy initiative!

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 145
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 09:43:55 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Bring in limitations to the size and setbacks. What happened to Option 2 on your display? |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Please, more trees to green our neighbourhoods, residential streets and our city. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Building heights are still too high for established neighbourhoods. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 146
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 09:51:33 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
We should go to Bylaw before Option 2.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
We should go to Bylaw before Option 2.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
We should go to Bylaw before Option 2.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| We should go to Bylaw before Option 2. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| We should go to Bylaw before Option 2. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| Go back to bylaw before Option 2. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| We already plan more than 2 trees | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: With tree preservation where will you put the home. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Go back to bylaw before Option 1 | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Let's go back before Option 2. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Let's go back before Option 2. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Let's keep Richmond Big and Beautiful.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 147
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 09:57:26 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

It's time to listen to the taxpayers of Richmond and not the developers who have taken advantage of the good people of Richmond.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 148
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 10:03:24 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Many of us will be watching very closely to see what council does to prevent a repeat of the "building massing" travesty that is presently occurring (in its most vivid and concentrated form) on Pelican Court in Westwind. A true abomination that council should be ashamed of. Is this the "vision" of housing in Richmond that our present council has permitted and endorses? The proposed changes will make a small dent in the vision from what I can tell. Unless there is a more dramatic change I will be looking and working for a dramatic clean sweep out of council in the next election. Again, I will be watching for significant change in policy and hope not to be disappointed. Over to you! My name is: [REDACTED] My email address is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 149
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 01, 2017 10:06:39 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The enormous size of some of the new houses has altered the neighbourhoods. Hard to know why folks need private homes of this size and need to be within inches of their neighbours. My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 150

Login: Paul

Responded Feb 01, 2017 10:22:59 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Limiting the construction of towering, monstrous houses will be better for community building.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I used to live in a SFD that backed on to a large SFD lot. Thankfully the new builders built a massive house with a large backyard. Although the house was massive, their large backyard gave breathing room to us and our neighbours. Their children played in their large backyard, and we were occasionally able to connect over the fence. These community connections will be lost if backyards are reduced to required 6 m green spaces.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: The houses built on SFD lots in the past 20 years have become more and more massive. We've allowed mansions to proliferate, leading to gentrification of whole neighbourhoods. With this has been the loss of landscaping, which impedes a community's health. Numerous health studies have shown that green spaces have positive health effects on people, and by limiting construction via option 3 the city is working to improve the health of its community. See here for a recent UBC study: http://www.med.ubc.ca/parks-big-and-small-needed-for-public-health/ | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: See previous comment. Green spaces are important to people's health, and by requiring trees to be planted we positively influence our community's mental health, activity, and overall well-being. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Isn't green space important for drainage? I see an abundance of massive, paved driveways behind gated fences that sit empty. It's a shame that this space does not function as a green space instead. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Why do we even allow front gates? They separate our community and our neighbours. If the goal of a city and a community is to disconnect one from another, then we should promote gates. But if there is the option to disallow or limit gates further then I believe this should be considered. Can we limit their construction to wood, and their height to 1 m? We would see more community connections without massive, brick-&-iron gates and thus happier people. It's astonishing how these numerous, small changes amalgamate to a large impact on the community. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| I chose Option 3 because it is the most limiting, but I hope that this option considers a single/double garage configuration. Otherwise, limiting the size is a good thing. | |
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | |
| If it maintains the same restrictions but brings clarity to the regulation, then yes I support it. | |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| Thank you for investigating this issue. On the one hand, it is much too late as all of Richmond has experienced the devastating effects of massive mansion construction for years now. But on the other hand, I and many others are glad that the City is doing something to restrict this practice from continuing. | |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | LetsTalkRichmond.ca website Facebook |



Respondent No: 151

Responded Feb 01, 2017 12:42:23 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 152

Responded Feb 01, 2017 12:52:33 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Stop adding rules and start cutting red tape.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

On a 33' x120' lot a 30' rear yard setback would make it impossible to maximize FAR. Stop making new rules. Let people build and plant what they want on their own property.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 153

Login: Joe Joe Joe

Responded Feb 01, 2017 14:15:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I feel we have government already regulating our lives too much. The government should not dictate to such minute detail on how I wish to have my future home. However, I am also an environmentalist, so if you cut down a healthy tree, then you should be responsible for planting a tree somewhere else.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 154

Login: gail

Responded Feb 01, 2017 16:27:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I don't know why the city is allowing these huge house's to be built when we need more homes for familys. On odlin Cres. the size of the houses going up is more than single family homes. Will they be renting out rooms?

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 155

Responded Feb 01, 2017 19:58:37 pm



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 156

Login: Aman

Responded Feb 01, 2017 20:59:59 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 157

Login: lcansoar

Responded Feb 02, 2017 11:10:49 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 158

Responded Feb 02, 2017 13:12:16 pm

- | | |
|--|--|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | Yes |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | Yes |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | Yes |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 159

Responded Feb 02, 2017 13:25:50 pm

- | | |
|--|--|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | Yes |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | Yes |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | Yes |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 160

Login: Celticgirl

Responded Feb 02, 2017 13:42:46 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 161

Login: lizzy

Responded Feb 02, 2017 15:25:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

thanks!

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 162

Login: bsoong

Responded Feb 02, 2017 22:47:21 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: To be clear as my knowledge of the language is low, my choice should state that I support larger spaces between the property line and the building. That is, the houses need to be smaller. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

**Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.Comments:

"tree" is quite vague as there are conical hedges with a trunk diameter of 1-3 inches. Then there are substantial trees of upwards of trunk diameter of 10 inches. But really, mature trees need to be protected on any area of the lot, not just in front and rear yard setbacks. As it stands, developers are completely clearing all trees when they prepare the lots. Mature trees are lost and the replacement trees are merely shrubs and tiny little saplings that often die.

**Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

Yes

**Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

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

**Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.Comments:

not answered

**Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

not answered

**Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

Yes

**Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

Who needs a 3 car garage?!

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

not answered

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

As it stands, all new houses that are built are done to the very limits for no other reason than re-sale. Hardly any of these houses are built for functional living space. The result is enormous loss of greenery (mature trees), sprawling garages and driveways, and towering houses that take away privacy and space for tall trees to provide natural shade, noise buffering and gas (oxygen and carbon dioxide) exchange.

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:** not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Facebook



Respondent No: 163

Login: Njay

Responded Feb 02, 2017 23:08:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 164

Login: Wonder

Responded Feb 03, 2017 05:48:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | I support option 2 |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It seems the wonderful people ,who do not reside in Richmond, and are making these submissions to council, do not take into any consideration, the people and families that currently live in the subdivisions where the construction is taking place. Come and live in my shoes for a year or two. That's how long we have to live with this intrusion next door. Isn't life wonderful!

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 165

Login: jas

Responded Feb 03, 2017 08:54:19 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
it will mess up the quality of housing in richmond
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 166

Login: Evertony

Responded Feb 03, 2017 09:01:43 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 167

Login: snoopv

Responded Feb 03, 2017 09:06:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 168

Login: marsiane

Responded Feb 03, 2017 10:43:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 169

Login: Snow

Responded Feb 03, 2017 10:58:05 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 170

Login: unknown

Responded Feb 03, 2017 11:12:22 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 171

Login: WestRichmondResident

Responded Feb 03, 2017 11:12:48 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Increasingly new build houses are being set back as far as possible into the rear yard which is blocking sunlight into neighbouring properties, and causing privacy concerns. With an addition of a rear yard outbuilding, there is almost an entire wall of buildings adjacent to the neighbouring property. Maximum depth needs to be reduced.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Excessive rear yard setbacks - done to accommodate a large paved front yard and parking - eliminate sunlight for adjacent properties. This is detrimental for homeowners who are endeavouring to use their backyards as a garden, particularly for vegetable production. This is contrary to what the City's position should be for sustainable locally grown produce, and green city initiatives.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

The addition of large, usually two story rear yard outbuildings, or coach houses, should be centered more towards the middle of the property. What little sunlight is able to enter a neighbouring property after completion of the house, is lost with an accessory building close to the property line.

Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. Yes

Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections

Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks not answered

Q16.Comments:

Side yard setbacks that project closer to the neighbouring property should not be allowed. This type of design is merely an end run around existing setback rules for the main house. It allows the City to say they have a reasonable setback policy, when in reality half of the building does not meet that policy, but is allowed much closer.

Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. Yes

Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards not answered

Q19.Comments

I see numerous decks on rooftops, and off of the third level here in West Richmond. How is this still being allowed? In the picture above for option #2 - it appears that the deck is larger than "50% of the wall it is built against" - on both sides! Trust that this is an oversight, and not how this will be interpreted by builders?

Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. Yes

Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings

Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping not answered

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q26.Comments:

No mention here about best efforts to maintain existing trees. There are numerous examples in West Richmond of trees being removed to accommodate driveway placement. Or rather the paving of almost the entire front yard for extended car parking. Replacement trees are often small landscape maples that may or may not survive two years. What is the point of mandating tree planting, if the new tree species is small and spindly with no growth opportunity. Why do we not require that replacement trees be of a similar species or growth potential?

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Minimum setbacks for the front gates mean that the footprint of the house gets pushed back further into the backyard as is the case now. The further the house goes back, the more it affects backyard privacy and sunlight .Instead there should be a maximum setback.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| The overall SIZE of the garage should be restricted if it is not included in the overall allowable size of the house. The overall setback of the house into the backyard needs to be reduced - this needs to be the priority. If this means reducing the allowing projection of the garage, then this needs to be addressed. | |
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | |
| Comparing two level houses that have been constructed over the past decade, you can easily see the creep upwards in what constitutes two storeys. Apparently we are all growing much taller. Retaining existing height allowances should be a trade-off for a reduction in footprint and setback. | |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| The City also needs to address the use of security and outdoor lighting on new builds. New houses now come with excessive outdoor lighting, often left on all night. With closer placement to neighbouring properties, this results in light pollution, as well as a waste of energy. The total number of permanent affixed outdoor lights on houses should be addressed. | |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Word of mouth |



Respondent No: 172

Login: kneuman

Responded Feb 03, 2017 11:49:19 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 173

Login: Lisa

Responded Feb 03, 2017 12:27:15 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Many new houses going up in my neighborhood encroach our back yard privacy, massive 4000 sqfoot homes are taking over and are forcing long time homeowners out as it is changing or neighborhood estetics. We don't know are neighborhoods anymore

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Allow lots that are 70+ wide and 200 depth to become subdivable into two homes so that the footprint is less intrusive on long time residents. This would also cut down on illegal suites which most of these mega mansions have and those homes are only being taxed as single residence, when clearly they are not

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 174

Login: Jen

Responded Feb 03, 2017 13:19:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
I can't read the small text on these images.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Again it's hard for me to read what's going on, but in general I support more yard and less house.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Yes, please! More plants and trees. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | And not skinny little trees that are barely there. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: I just want to clarify - does landscaping include a lawn? I answered option 3 with the assumption that landscaping is anything living rather than pavement. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Building height doesn't bother me much since it doesn't take space away from nature. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It would have been really helpful to see larger versions of the illustrations. I wasn't able to read the small text.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|----------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Facebook |
|--|----------|



Respondent No: 175

Login: Feargus

Responded Feb 03, 2017 14:52:48 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Need to be big trees |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 176

Login: Moreta

Responded Feb 03, 2017 15:25:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 177

Login: kathleen

Responded Feb 03, 2017 15:25:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 178

Login: Ngozi

Responded Feb 03, 2017 15:39:46 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 179

Login: Marlow

Responded Feb 03, 2017 15:50:17 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 180

Login: kman

Responded Feb 03, 2017 16:17:04 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 181

Login: feeng

Responded Feb 03, 2017 17:48:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 182

Login: walkernurse

Responded Feb 03, 2017 18:28:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 183

Login: Lesley

Responded Feb 03, 2017 20:23:43 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | I think there should also be more emphasis on keeping mature trees when lots are cleared for new construction |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

As we have almost lost our sense of community I think it important to have slightly smaller more welcoming looking houses. My only concern about the requirement to have front landscaping is that there also be a requirement for it to be maintained to some minimum standard. I also think it is time to encourage developers to build maximum 2 level town homes, some with the master bedrooms on the ground floor for those in Richmond who would like to downside and be able to stay in the community. There aren't too many new townhouses suitable for aging Richmondites especially those with slight mobility issues.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 184

Login: BPR

Responded Feb 03, 2017 21:09:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 185

Login: rcdubya

Responded Feb 03, 2017 23:20:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 186

Login: ElizaB

Responded Feb 04, 2017 00:09:30 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 187

Login: FamilyFirst

Responded Feb 04, 2017 09:00:36 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 188

Login: Karanga

Responded Feb 04, 2017 11:03:58 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We have to stop all these enormous houses being built, especially on the ALR. When is City Council going to read the letters to the Editor of the Richmond News where local residents have been writing in and complaining about these monstrosities being built and ruining our neighbourhoods for months?

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 189

Login: mcuthb

Responded Feb 04, 2017 11:12:26 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 190

Login: SteveSethi

Responded Feb 04, 2017 11:16:52 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 191

Responded Feb 04, 2017 11:34:42 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 192

Responded Feb 04, 2017 11:39:49 am

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I don't want to see mega houses blocking out the sun or view of established houses in the community

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

not answered

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

I'd like to see more green space, trees and shrubs in front and back yards instead of fences with gates as well as bricked or concrete driveways.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Option 2 is the best of the poor choices. I would like to see the maximum of 6 ft. as the norm because of privacy and fire. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: I'd like to see more green space instead of side garages that are covered in brick. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| I would like to see at least two trees on the lot. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| I like this idea as it changes the look of mega houses from concrete jungles to look similar to the lawns of established houses in the neighbourhood. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| I do not like the amendment to the Zoning Bylaw as it doesn't mention the option of having no fences. Houses in the community that don't have fences are faced with the feeling that the owners of mega houses want to be isolated and not part of the neighbourhood. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| <hr/> | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

I like option 2. Existing houses will not be dwarfed by mega houses.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I have lived in Richmond since 1977 and do not like this city the way it has grown. Council has not listened to the residents but definitely to the developers. The Island by NATURE is now an Island of Brick, Stucco and pavement. Gone are ALR lands to mega houses with low taxes and no farming. Existing neighbourhoods have been condemned to unlicensed B&B's, blocked out sun and little or no privacy. Elections are coming this year and I will remember those on Council who have not listened!

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 193

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:28:21 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Leave Richmond the way it is!

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 194

Login: Sel

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:31:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I hope to see no change in Richmond as I am happy with the way everything is. If others are happy with the way Richmond is right now then laws should not be changed because of some complaints.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 195

Login: Inds

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:38:14 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am fine with the way Richmond is and don't want to see any change.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 196

Login: snowman

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:39:37 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No opinion

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Consider allowing a shed closer to a fence if the shed wall along the fence is no higher than the fence, and the style and materials blend with the adjacent structure(s).

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Either #2 or #3. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

This could require input from an arborist, since the wrong trees can be as bad as none.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

1- a landscape architect would be best to ask for further opinion. 2- This should take into account how eager the owner is to maintain these shrubs/trees.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

If locked doors can't ensure total protection, what use is a gate? But the safety issue is a good point.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Have you considered a 2 garage limit with allowance for 1 carport or garage at 90 degrees to the main garage that a future owner could turn back into house space easily? I agree that a 3 car garage gets unsightly and is begging for a 4 car garage.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

I support anything that will prevent a recurrence of the disastrous appearance on display in north Springwood Crescent, what we here all call 'ugly houses'.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 197

Login: Ravi

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:46:46 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I want Richmond to stay the way it is and really hope it does.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 198

Login: Arjan

Responded Feb 04, 2017 12:54:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 199

Login: Gavin

Responded Feb 04, 2017 13:00:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I like how Richmond is now and will not be too thrilled with the change.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 200

Login: sramji

Responded Feb 04, 2017 13:16:31 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 201

Login: Jovan

Responded Feb 04, 2017 14:18:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Leave Richmond how it is, don't change any regulations.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Leave Richmond the same, L-shape houses make Richmond unique.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 202

Login: Munjovan

Responded Feb 04, 2017 14:25:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 203

Login: Casper

Responded Feb 04, 2017 14:34:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| There should be no side yard projections as this limits access for firefighting and back yard gardening. It also makes the home much too close to adjacent homes. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 204

Login: skubby

Responded Feb 04, 2017 14:40:13 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
stop messing with richmond leave everthing the same
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 205

Login: MH

Responded Feb 04, 2017 15:40:00 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

The net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot.

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| The net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| The net result is to increase green space and live landscape on the lot. It's not good enough that developers pay the city to provide green space and tree plantings elsewhere in the city. Our existing neighbourhood has many mature trees on the older owner's lot. Every new house seems to get a permit to destroy these wonderful trees. Now when you look around the neighbourhood, you only see ill-maintained, minimal sized planted area, roof tops of the new houses and the trees that the city planted along the street. The neighbourhood is becoming devoid of these trees on the owner's lot. It should be required that the new houses keep the mature trees. The city trees should not be the only trees protected when a new house is built. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| See Board 13 for comments. The more trees the better. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: | |
| See Board 13 for comments. Also, the net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: | |
| There should be NO fence or gate allowed along the front. The front fence and gate produces exclusion in the neighbourhood i.e. keep out I don't want to integrate or get to know the neighbours. The city does not promote inclusiveness by fostering exclusion. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| The net result is to decrease house size and hard surface areas on the lot. | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Our neighbourhood has many, many different starting elevations for new houses. It's ridiculous that starting elevation has not been defined previously.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The developers have had too much say and power in how the city develops the housing market and in the formulation of bylaws. Their only concern has been to increase their investment return. They don't care about the neighbourhood and the people who live there. It's about time that city planners are perhaps doing something about the lack of good planning in our existing neighborhoods albeit 20 years too late. We need city planners that have some backbone, and stand up for the existing older home owners' that have been given that 'cold shoulder' by city hall. Lack of leadership on this issue has resulted in many families leaving Richmond in frustration. Those of us living here welcome our new neighbors but wish to have a neighbourhood rich in trees, birds and green spaces for all to enjoy.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Word of mouth



Respondent No: 206

Login: Karry

Responded Feb 04, 2017 16:36:27 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 207

Login: Penny22

Responded Feb 04, 2017 16:49:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 208

Login: Hfrankel

Responded Feb 04, 2017 17:36:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 209

Login: Jennifer

Responded Feb 04, 2017 17:59:55 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

These obscene sized houses being built needs to be stopped.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

Yes

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

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

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

Let's bring quality of life sized backyards back. A space where families can enjoy outdoor space, again.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

No extra buildings with the exception of a (maximum) two car garage

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.**

No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Let's bring greenery back |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Why only two? |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Can you spell landscaping to improve neighbourhood s? | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Why gates at all? | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Two story maximum | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Let's go back to a community based neighborhoods.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|--|-----------------|



Respondent No: 210

Responded Feb 04, 2017 18:14:23 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Homes have gotten too large with no green spaces around them.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Large homes have been overshadowing their neighbours and destroying the good use of what was their private space.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Houses that are too close together are a fire hazard to one another and I have seen this happen on No. 1 road, between Williams and Francis Roads. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments The size of second story decks must be reduced to ensure ANY privacy for the neighbours. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Green spaces are much more desirable and better for the overall environment. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| Our neighbourhoods need new trees planted as so much has been removed for building lots. Yes, force builders to plant trees, but better still, charge them mightily for removing healthy trees. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Regulations on gate setbacks are necessary. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Homes on a street are much look and feel more desirable if they are ALL a consistent height.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Builders have gotten away with far too many breeches of ethical practices and destroyed the quality of Richmond neighbourhoods. Please make our neighbourhoods healthy again.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 211

Login: abrose

Responded Feb 04, 2017 19:04:27 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 212

Login: DA916529520

Responded Feb 04, 2017 19:18:19 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 213

Login: simim88

Responded Feb 04, 2017 20:01:16 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

These changes are ridiculous and will effect the economy and job situation of Richmond.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 214

Login: rdhaliwal18

Responded Feb 04, 2017 20:24:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 215

Login: Jennylee

Responded Feb 04, 2017 20:48:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: NO Gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 216

Login: Bigbird

Responded Feb 04, 2017 21:22:10 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 217

Responded Feb 04, 2017 21:39:37 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
-One of the more important controls. -Must include garage in calculation
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
-Option 3 is the most flexible for all lot sizes.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|--|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| -Eliminate all projections. -This loophole is abused by builders today and floor area is not counted. - There is no need for chimneys and a bay window into a 4 foot space is redundant. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| If houses were built more efficiently decks would not be needed to access outdoor spaces. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| -Increase green space wherever it is possible. -Leave lot coverage alone. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| -Focus must be retention of mature trees. -Replacement trees must be approved species and significant size. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: -Also limit driveways to 6m in width. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: -These unwelcoming structures are not appropriate for single family neighbourhoods. -Ban brick walls and gates altogether. -Or, set walls back 20 feet from property line. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: -Eliminate side facing garage projections entirely. -Relocate driveways to retain significant trees. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

-Review with architects on City of Richmond Advisory Design Panel. -Provide a direct comparison with average Metro Vancouver municipalities design controls. -Ensure a design professional communicates to City Council exactly what mix of bylaw changes will achieve. -Explain exactly what they are voting for and what this will achieve.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 218

Login: csmerdon

Responded Feb 05, 2017 07:16:41 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Perhaps I missed it in the documents, but I'm not sure why an accessory building would need to be more than 10m2. Are we talking about sheds or potential coach houses?

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: The way I understand this, a house could be designed with a part that projects from the main building (for aesthetic or functional purposes) but as long as it doesn't infringe upon the minimum side setback, under option 3 that would be allowed. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments What about rooftop decks? Are they even allowed? There are of course many new houses with decks on the roof that really overlook their neighbours. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: I don't like to have to regulate this but in the absence of individuals taking responsibility for community health and wellbeing, the more greenery that is required, the better. Maybe we can return to making the most of the fertile land we live on. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: not answered | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Are there requirements for rear landscaping? That is where you can also have an impact on your neighbours' peace and enjoyment of their gardens. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

That seems to make a lot of sense and is more fair than the current measurement.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News |
|---|---|



Respondent No: 219

Login: Michaela

Responded Feb 05, 2017 08:02:50 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 220

Login: LauraH

Responded Feb 05, 2017 08:48:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Our cities need green space!! Not concrete. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Less driveway, more beauty. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: People have a right to protect their properties, but they're not protecting fortresses! | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I'm participating in this survey because I care about our city, but I think this exercise is too little, too late, unfortunately. The city has already been too greatly affected by the lack of building requirements to go back now.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 221

Login: HollywoodOz

Responded Feb 05, 2017 09:19:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I would like to see a bylaw demanding two trees (not hedges) planted for every mature tree removed during renovation or construction.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Facebook



Respondent No: 222

Login: b0z0

Responded Feb 05, 2017 09:21:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 223

Responded Feb 05, 2017 09:29:01 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 224

Responded Feb 05, 2017 11:20:56 am

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This survey is very limiting in its set up. The new builds heights should be reviewed as well.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The whole issue of these tear downs and new builds should be under complete review and any applications should be stopped and not grandfathered until this review is conducted.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Same opinion as provided for the back yard opinions.

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: not answered | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

The new built homes are overpowering the existing homes and it a blatant invasion of privacy for the existing homes, so much so we have installed blinds on all our windows that allow for the light to come in but maintain our privacy.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The existing new builds that are currently finished and/or in progress and partially completed (i.e. no landscaping in place) and for sale even before completion should all undergo inspection as many of them in the Shellmont area are usually empty as is the existing home behind us on Sealord. It has a timed/programmed light and window security system to make it seem as if someone is home, but the front gates are closed and have been that way since Dec 2016. There appears about every three months or so a rotation of different residents that occupy the home for a short period of time and then a different set of people come through. Currently we live with constant construction noise by way of excavators pounding on foundations to remove them, hammering and general constructions noise on a rotational basis. The trucks that are carrying away construction debris or bring in fill have ripped up the back alley ways and frontage on many of the neighborhood homes, so much so Richmond Bylaws was called in to set the trucks straight as road and lane usage. Pretty much the new builds are usually occupied by a new owner who bought just prior to completion, they are occupied by rotational groups of visitors/guests/transient visitors or they are rotationally empty or older homes are bought and turned into rental homes and currently we are surrounded by quite a few of those rentals. Perhaps the City of Richmond should take a walk in these neighborhoods and take a good look at what is really happening to these neighborhoods, rather than jumping in and making changes that will hopefully satisfy those of us who have to really live with and experience this decimation of what had been a really wonderful neighborhood. Even a drive down Williams Road where there have been homes taken down and two houses built whereby these new homes are currently either unkempt, have their front and side fences falling apart crooked and/or canted and there are partial gardens in progress on what was the front green space, because everywhere else on these lots is cement. Thus far most of these homes appear to be rentals and to date there has been couple of meth lab busts one of which was a house on Williams Road not far from our home. Yes we need changes but we need changes based on a complete review not based on the money going into the city of Richmond coffers but on maintaining a good neighborhood that promotes great relations between all the neighbors no matter what their interesting differences may be.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|---|-----------------|



Respondent No: 225

Login: Rahbek

Responded Feb 05, 2017 13:02:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I have not made comments along the way, To me it's all just common sense, give everybody a change to enjoy their home without a huge mass next door taking all the sunshine and light, not to mention privacy. The houses are much bigger than is necessary for a family, even two generations, but expectation and entitlement are changing Richmond. 1500 square feet was considered a good sized home. With a nice green lawn in front, it was heaven. I guess my age is showing, 76 years young.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|--|-----------------|



Respondent No: 226

Login: G Pope

Responded Feb 05, 2017 14:18:15 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Anything to increase green space in residential areas is important, for keeping Richmond cooler & cleaner, and to avoid having our children growing up in a concrete jungle. Please limit square footage of driveways, too.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Again, increasing green space is so important to our community beauty & health.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Makes sense to limit it based on overall width, as a wider building feels more encroaching/oppressive than a smaller one.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: I support allowing one, as we don't want to take away all individuality & personal choices, but limiting to one increases air flow, & decreases "massing." | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Privacy concerns are alleviated by the deck owner simply not using the deck if s/he feels concerned. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| I think having the exception makes the amendment very fair and of benefit to all (trees make oxygen) | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| If you include grass, then 60%; if you don't include grass, then you should. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Your board does not indicate a gate to me, as the arrow points to a short fence, not a gate, IMO. I think gates should be allowable by the same rules as fences, & deemed a part of the overall fence. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| I think all building(s), including garage, should count towards existing(or amended) lot use restrictions. You say garages larger than 50m ² would count as part of the home; why not any size counting as either part of the house, or as an outbuilding? | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | not answered |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | not answered |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News |



Respondent No: 227

Login: lanamcc

Responded Feb 05, 2017 14:25:39 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This is 5% over the normal 45% footprint of house vs property ratio.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

rear yard must have grass and shrubbery

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | <p>trees of substance and if they die, they need to be removed and replaced. All the dead cedar hedges you see around Richmond are ridiculous. The company who planted them should be held accountable for the survival of the plantings.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Option 2. Why are they needed/necessary? What are people hiding or trying to keep out? It gives a negative vibe. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: There are many dwellings built on pre-load that is substantially higher than the roadways. How is this allowed? Is this not something that is part of building inspections? | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Can you tell me how single family dwellings can incorporate 21 bedrooms and bathrooms? I see that there are some mega homes being constructed in Burkeville. This is a tragedy. I would like to see neighbourhoods be kept tasteful in structure and composition.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 228

Login: smoked salmon

Responded Feb 05, 2017 17:02:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 229

Login: Klaas

Responded Feb 05, 2017 17:40:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 230

Login: Tracy D

Responded Feb 05, 2017 18:22:43 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 231

Login: JenP

Responded Feb 05, 2017 21:08:55 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I would support allowing a laneway house or some other building designed for and being used by a second family to take up further lot depth

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I would support allowing a laneway house or some other building designed for and being used by a second family to be built on this setback

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: With accommodations made for lots that have a laneway house or similar for a second family, used as such (effectively multi-family dwellings) | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | not answered |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | not answered |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | not answered |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | not answered |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 232

Responded Feb 05, 2017 21:34:26 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I have lived in Richmond since the 80's and love it.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 233

Login: lancing

Responded Feb 06, 2017 07:02:18 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Option 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Option 2 | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Every decision that is made should be made with the vision statement: To be the most appealing, livable and well-managed city in Canada It is like the wild west living in Richmond and chaos needs to stop! Residents should have a say not the greed of the developers.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Facebook |
|--|-----------------------------|



Respondent No: 234

Login: old school

Responded Feb 06, 2017 10:00:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The massive houses being built are a huge problem for most areas. They are like hotels. 8+ cars to a house and 3 car garages they never use. Gates are always closed. Makes you wonder what is in the garages as they never open. They park all over blocking already narrow side streets. The new houses are so close to property lines if there ever was a fire the whole street would light up. I would rather see large properties sub divided so two smaller houses could be built. Something the residents of Richmond need. This has gone on for so long I am not sure at this point it can be fixed. I do hope you can do something to existing mega homes so they park on their own properties.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 235

Login: Joan

Responded Feb 06, 2017 12:37:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 236

Responded Feb 06, 2017 14:38:35 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
I believe that there are changes needed to regulate rear and side yards especially where a rear garage is proposed with access from the front of the building. These garages additionally "might" contain an above ground accommodation.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Option 2 | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

This requirement for two (2) trees to be planted should also specify accepted species, we would want a cheap onerous pine and that the tree chosen should have a minimum certain size (not seedling)

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

Lets give some weight to yard maintenance and increase in overall cost of construction, landscaping can be very expensive. That said, if that additionally impacts your section on front walls with electric gates and the changes to accommodate "auto entry/waiting" then both options 2 & 3 may need re-visiting.

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

option 2

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

Not an easy one, I don't like the massing of L shaped gargaes in certain neighbourhoods, that said, if you have a larger home then 3 car garage seems appropriate.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: | not answered |
| Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | not answered |
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |



Respondent No: 237

Login: papa

Responded Feb 06, 2017 15:02:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gates, it is lot more neighborly. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 238

Login: why

Responded Feb 06, 2017 17:12:05 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Need to also encourage "greening" of the non-dwelling part of the lot. By that I mean having a garden, lawn, flowers, trees or the like rather than just paving over the un-built portion.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

In respect of existing houses in the neighborhood, setbacks should be approximately the same as them. By that I mean that new houses should fit into the "footprint" of existing houses to achieve a balanced streetscape. That would minimize the disruption and loss of enjoyment of property to the adjoining homeowners.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Definitely. Some decks are being built so that they become observation platforms into neighbours' houses. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: If we are to put substance into our City motto "Island city, by nature" we must insist on "green" landscaping. Otherwise we will be "Island city, devoid of nature". | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| If a new house blocks a significant amount of sunlight from a neighbor's yard, trees should not be planted in a location that would block more sunlight. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q40.Comments:

Should also consider the height of existing houses in the neighborhood. New houses should not be permitted to be built more than a small amount above a neighborhood average. The goal would be to create a "balanced" neighborhood rather than a chaotic-looking jumble of out-of-place buildings.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Unfortunately these proposals are too late for my neighborhood. The LUC rush of the past year has seen to that. It is time for sanity to prevail. Besides these city-wide proposals I would suggest we consider neighborhoods as distinct planning areas. You could then have the following: 1. Neighborhood consultations prior to any development beyond one or two houses. 2. The release of new house plans to the neighborhood prior to them being approved by the City. This would permit residents to see what is proposed and to give their input. Now we do not have the right to view the plans of individual houses and thus buildings are a surprise and we are told that it is "too late" to do anything. This builds frustration and a sense of "no one represents us" among residents. 3. A commitment to keeping the "scale" of a neighborhood the same. New houses will be welcome but they must generally fit in with the existing ones. 4. Consider the idea of "Heritage Neighborhoods". A heritage designation can apply to an area - it does not have to apply only to heritage buildings or villages. 5. There is a strong perception in our community that City Council heavily favors the real estate industry (including builders) over residents and isn't respectful of long-time residents or their neighborhoods. Council needs to be aware of this and to address it with actions - not words, studies and delays.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Twitter



Respondent No: 239

Login: jlaloge

Responded Feb 06, 2017 18:03:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We have been a residents of Richmond for 37 years. We have witnessed the flurry of development under the now expired LUC. It has been disheartening to watch the destruction of our neighbourhoods. We wonder how City Council could have allowed this to happen. We are now experiencing in our own area the demolition of many homes, including a house next door to us--only to be replaced by a house that covers approximately 80% of the lot. Trees and gardens have been destroyed as well. It is time to change the bylaws.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 240

Login: Ebrown

Responded Feb 06, 2017 23:07:39 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not sure if 50% or 55% is better; different size of lot should have different requirements. should have only small, medium and lot size lots. setbacks should be based on density people live on small lots should expect their neighbours are closer to them, people live on bigger lot expect there are more separation between houses.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

ok with bigger back yard but the actual setback should base on zoning, not the depth and size of the lot. I want to make sure my neighbours (at the back and on both sides) have the same setbacks. don't want to see my neighbours have a smaller setback because the depth of their lot is a little bit shorter than mine.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

setback to the accessory building should be larger, don't want to see neighbours' building or garage right next to my back yard and blocking my sun shine. all back yards should be limited to landscaping.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

widen the current side yard setback requirement and then allow small projections on a small portion of the building on both sides of the buildings.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q19.Comments

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: should ask for 3 trees per lot | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: if the building is setback more than the min. setback requirement, 60% should be based on the area between the front lot line and the building face, not just 60% of the required front yard setback back (i.e., not just the first 6 m of the lot). | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |

Q37.Comments:

this should be based on the zoning, small, medium and lot size lots and the location of the lot. if it is a large lot, ok to allow 3 car garage. but if it is small lot, better to limit to 2 car garage, and maybe no projection at all. the zoning should dictate whether a L-shape driveway is allowed or not. just want to make sure the character of each neighbourhood stays the same.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

don't see why we need so many different single family zones (A to K?). should be just small, medium and large, and create a different set of zoning requirements for each kind of lots.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): Word of mouth



Respondent No: 241
Login: JustineJustJustine

Responded Feb 07, 2017 09:58:51 am
At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Our community was an actual community before foreign buyers decided to turn Richmond into a city of empty mega mansions and boutique hotels. Huge houses are invasive and not good for our environment. Too many houses that are perfectly liveable are being torn down because of greed. This is an ugly look on Richmond.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Green space has to come first. If people don't like it then move to an apartment or go back to wherever they came from | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Trees and larger lawns were once the status quo in Richmond and I would like to see a return to that. Houses that should only be on large acreages do not belong in the suburbs. Egomaniacal house plans should no longer be able to keep Richmond as the joke it has become. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| I would like to see older trees being saved and old gardens should be maintained and not destroyed | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| <hr/> | |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| Front yards are just that; yards! No house should take up the whole lot, well not in the suburbs anyway. | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Who are people trying to keep out? I think it's more like what are they trying to hide! It looks bad and makes neighbors wary of each other to have giant fences | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| <hr/> | |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q40.Comments:

No one should be allowed to block the sun from other people's yards. Again Richmond is a suburb and if someone wants a giant house they can buy an acreage and do it there

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

For far too long developers and foreign investors have been allowed to run amok in our city. Building boutique hotels on ALR farmland and giant monster houses in neighbourhood like Seafair where I grew up. When are we going to put the people that live here and love it first? Or is it all about the greed? Our city is a national joke and cautionary tale. I want that to change. Please help Richmond be beautiful once again.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|---|-----------------|



Respondent No: 242

Login: Pam

Responded Feb 07, 2017 15:02:10 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This would be an improvement on privacy for neighbors and maybe increase the green space these house should be including for the health of residents of Richmond.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

not answered

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: These houses are so close together now that, if there was a fire the adjoining homes would be damaged. Adjoining homes are also losing much of their daylight. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: I would also like to feel that the lot will not return to concrete once the house is occupied. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| please be sure to specify that a pyramidalis cedar is for hedging only. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

The developers are getting very creative in avoiding building heights. Should not be encouraged.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story



Respondent No: 243

Login: Lori

Responded Feb 07, 2017 16:23:42 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 244

Login: M McConnell

Responded Feb 08, 2017 09:49:59 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 245

Login: Fastrac627

Responded Feb 08, 2017 11:08:47 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I am strongly opposing any action by the City that I pay property tax, to have policy that has the potential of reducing the attractiveness as well as pricing of Richmond' single detached lots.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 246

Login: Margaret

Responded Feb 08, 2017 12:00:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 247

Login: richmond citizen

Responded Feb 08, 2017 13:56:59 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

For a family of 6, we have 3 cars. Double garage would never be justified. Also due to lots of car break-ins in the city it is totally unsafe NOT to park the car inside my own property. I really don't understand why the City would want to change to status quo. I would suggest the City to closely look into the increase crime rate and break-ins. That would be most beneficial to the citizens.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 248

Login: gmae

Responded Feb 08, 2017 14:04:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 249

Login: Lc homes

Responded Feb 08, 2017 14:34:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 250

Responded Feb 08, 2017 15:16:27 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 251

Login: Jaz

Responded Feb 08, 2017 16:03:48 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 252

Login: jebm

Responded Feb 08, 2017 17:02:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 253

Login: Mei Law

Responded Feb 08, 2017 17:47:17 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 254

Login: donald

Responded Feb 08, 2017 19:31:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 255

Login: JH59

Responded Feb 08, 2017 20:12:49 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

More grass and trees are needed because of the impacts of climate change globally

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

This avoids encroachment on the house behind and minimizes the loss of light for the house next door or behind

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

These amendments should have be done years ago before our community was negatively and permanently affected. The loss of trees has been the biggest visual change.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 256

Login: kitty

Responded Feb 09, 2017 10:37:25 am

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

It is getting very expensive to own and maintain a detached single house in Richmond. Any working class families have been having a hard time paying a huge mortgage for their home. We have to cut down on other daily expenses to be able to have the ends meet. Making more restrictions to the bylaw simply reduces the value of our properties. We don't think our current bylaws are causing any inconvenience to our neighbourhood. Instead of using a great deal of resources of the city to amend and enforce the new bylaws, we would rather want to see the resources used in other areas such as community services, libraries, parks, and roads. Amending bylaws does not help to create a harmonious community.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q19.Comments

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | not answered |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | not answered |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | not answered |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | not answered |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 257

Responded Feb 09, 2017 12:20:04 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 258

Login: MarilynA

Responded Feb 09, 2017 13:06:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | I support more trees in Richmond! If possible, landowners should plant more than two. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Yes. Follow the fundamental rule of architecture: the building must fit in with its surroundings, not stand out like a sore thumb. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I hope that the new zoning requirements will ensure that new buildings will not unduly impact the amount of sunlight the neighbours get. Some of the new houses are too high and block out sun and invade private backyard spaces.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 259

Login: TonyB

Responded Feb 09, 2017 13:16:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 260

Login: jadah1

Responded Feb 09, 2017 14:11:58 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I think that front entry gates are destroying the feel of our community and serve no purpose. They don't provide any security. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 261

Login: bonnie

Responded Feb 09, 2017 15:24:14 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 262

Login: Edward Davis

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:00:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
We don't want rooming houses in our neighborhood, Just single family dwellings.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| We're already densely packed as it is. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Entry gates should not be visibly obtrusive. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We saw 5 perfectly good quality houses get sold and knocked down in our Doulton Avenue neighborhood as a result of the recent (2015) building restriction changes. The following is a list of the changes this is creating in our neighborhood. - Increased traffic. The huge new house near the corner of Dorval on Doulton has rental suites. We know this because of the 5 vehicles parked around it on the street in the evening, where there were never any cars parked when the previous house existed. So we have increased traffic and less available parking. Is it being taxed as a single family residence? - the once quiet neighborhood now has increased traffic including huge trucks rumbling by, used in the new demolition and construction. Now there are strangers, construction workers and the like in our neighborhood. We don't know these people. - so far in 2017, there are 5 houses for sale, as the former long term residents try to cash out and leave the area. This creates a feeling of instability and estrangement. - the huge new houses don't fit the character of the neighborhood. They don't have nice yards, just a huge house with who knows how many people living in it. - what happens to the excellent quality wood, brick and stone from the demolished homes? This is a huge waste of resources and is not environmentally conservative. - construction noise. We wish to live in a quiet area, not one that has continual construction noise. It's obtrusive.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 263

Login: Makhan53

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:11:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 264

Login: Shanns77

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:14:15 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 265

Login: Steven91

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:21:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 266

Login: Manutd

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:39:11 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This has been working for over 20 years why change it? Just because of a small group that's demanding this change . I was under the impression we live in democratic society , where the majority is supposed to rule.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Presently everyone is having a tough time trying to maintain the existing lawns they have . In our neighbourhood 90 % of the lawns are completely destroyed by the raccoons who continually digging them up and looking for food (grubs) .

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Houses that were built 30 years ago usually had big decks at the back and they usually had their barbecue parties and there were no issues !! The new houses now only have very small decks and often are used as smoking areas. So I don't see what's the problem. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: | |
| <p>These gates and stone fences on the new house only exist in areas where there are no sidewalks and in fact is a recent trend that's become to common. All the subdivisions, Terra Nova , Oaks and California do not have that problem I can see a safety issue with these gates on main roads but I don't see a problem on the side streets .</p> | |
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

This and few other issues were addressed in the last amendment a few months ago . So, are we setting a trend that every year we will have to re visit these issues to keep certain people happy.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Word of mouth |
|---|----------------------------------|



Respondent No: 267

Login: Andy38

Responded Feb 09, 2017 17:46:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 268

Login: Parv79

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:00:50 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 269

Login: billydirt

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:13:36 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

the new houses being built all around our home are monster homes with little to no yard with vegetation, while the front yard is almost completely paved.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

bigger back yards in these proposed changes will help mitigate loss of privacy for adjoining neighbours. Should be retroactive!!

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

need smaller building footprints of these new houses.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: need greenspace in side yards too. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments need to minimize loss of privacy of neighbours | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: All the new houses built, & under construction (8) in my immediate Fairbrook Crescent area, have had their yards totally stripped of all vegetation AND top soil before construction. When the token "greening" occurs the black material acting as top soil is very thin, and frequently the sod and new plants do not survive. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| see comments above. Way too many existing healthy trees are sacrificed for these monster homes | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| as above two boards | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| these fence & gate properties send a message: not friendly or neighbourly, and that is the situation in my immediate area | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| no need for a garage to have such a large presence | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

we don't need castles built in a single house family neighbourhood. Intrude on privacy and create shadows

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Please change these bylaws to restore some sense of community neighbourly-ness!! See all my previous comments.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 270

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:15:38 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 271

Login: Digimax

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:40:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 272

Login: Sasha

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:50:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 273

Login: JF

Responded Feb 09, 2017 18:59:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 274

Login: Rara

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:14:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 275

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:23:42 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I did not see anything in here about reducing the height of the ground floor ceiling before the square footage is double counted. We should have the same allowable height as Vancouver. I also believe that the free space for entry foyers should be reduced or eliminated.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 276

Login: Lq

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:32:04 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No opinion
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No Opinion
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 277

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:42:06 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 278

Login: benson

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:44:17 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 279

Login: ncumming

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:46:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| <p>Q16.Comments:</p> <p>Side yard setbacks are meaningless if you allow encroachments, as has been past practice. The eaves are already allowed to encroach, then we had projections allowed to encroach, and now we're debating how many projections and how much encroachment. Keep it simple and definitive so the builders are no longer able to game the system to circumvent the intent of the bylaw.</p> | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| <p>Q19.Comments</p> <p>There is no need or justification for an elevated deck at all unless there is a view. If there is, it implies there isn't a neighbour whose privacy would be compromised. Privacy of existing homes and yards should trump the need for an elevated deck that has no view. If a deck is wanted that badly, put it at ground level.</p> | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| <p>Q23.Comments:</p> <p>not answered</p> | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: | |
| There is no need or justification for vehicle gates, stone walls or iron fences in residential neighbourhoods. They should be banned outright. Low wooden fences, shrubbery or hedges are acceptable alternatives. | |
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| If the garage has a loft or attic more than 1.2 m high the entire floor area of the garage should be included in the FAR. Similarly, patio covers or canopies that are essentially an extension of the building or roof line should be included in the FAR. | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

The proposed changes are nothing more than tinkering, and will not do anything to address the root of the problem, which is that current and long term residents of Richmond are being imposed upon in favour of a handful of builders and future owners of their projects who are, I expect for the most part, NOT residents of Richmond at the moment. We are living in established, mature residential neighbourhoods. They should not be turned into constant construction zones. It is unconscionable that the City is allowing our quality of life and the livability of our neighbourhoods to be degraded this way. It must stop! The City owes its first and foremost fiduciary duty to the residents who are here now. We owe nothing to the builders lobby and future owners of houses. Please, let's shift the focus back to where it belongs.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 280

Login: cisi

Responded Feb 09, 2017 19:48:56 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 281

Login: Colin

Responded Feb 09, 2017 20:21:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 282

Responded Feb 09, 2017 20:41:58 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 283

Login: Steven8m

Responded Feb 09, 2017 21:24:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 284

Login: harry

Responded Feb 10, 2017 07:44:56 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 285

Responded Feb 10, 2017 08:57:24 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 286

Login: Colleen

Responded Feb 10, 2017 09:31:51 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 287

Responded Feb 10, 2017 09:54:01 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 288

Login: Morning

Responded Feb 10, 2017 10:17:37 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 289

Responded Feb 10, 2017 10:26:15 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 290

Login: BCSkier52

Responded Feb 10, 2017 10:26:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 291

Login: history

Responded Feb 10, 2017 11:11:19 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | We need to bring back some natural greenery to Richmond. No more paved front yards for multi car garages and brick walls with iron gates. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | It would be nice to have our neighborhoods start to look like neighborhoods rather than the current brick and mortar greenless front yards on the new mega houses |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: It would be nice to have our neighborhoods start to look like neighborhoods rather than the current brick and mortar greenless front yards on the new mega houses | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

The drawing show 9 metres from the road to the top of the roof. This does not seem to restrict a devious contractor or owner to incorporate a third floor so the overshadowing monster houses can still overshadow an older neighborhood.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

What about addressing the problem with mega houses/hotels on ALR land? They continue to be built and I would like to know if they are on sewer/water meters, get away with farm related taxes and how the City and building department can approve a "house plan" with 14 bathrooms, 14 bedrooms and an 8 car garage. Does no one ever ask a question or just "stamp approved" ??

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 292

Responded Feb 10, 2017 11:19:09 am

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

As long as a "Functional" house can achieve maximum allowable square footage in order to make efficient use of scarcely available land.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I feel this option 2 will enhance the look and feel of the home as well as provide additional yard space. Unfortunately, these days people do not utilize rear yard spaces do to lack of privacy, size and weather, and therefore, the space will probably be wasted.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

This sound reasonable to me and would probably have a limited effect on value of the property.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: I believe the projections should be allowed, however they should be limited to the first floor. The projections help to break up long continuous walls. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments The setback should only apply to the side yard. The rear yard setback for the house is already greater than the side yard setback would be for a deck in this scenario. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: In order to construct a "Functional" home that achieves the maximum square footage and contains much needed low income housing in the form of a secondary suite the designer needs flexibility in his or her layout. The efficient use of scarce land requires that the buildings be built in such a way as to maximize the utilization of the land. | |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: Absolutely. The trees should re required to be retained for a minimum of 2 years with bonding required. In other municipalities it has become the practice of builders to plant trees for inspection and remove them after occupancy permit is issued. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: The yard space is needed for natural infiltration of rain water so that not every drop ends up in our already stressed storm system. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: This will simply turn the area outside the gate into parking spot. If such gate set back is required it should be measured from the back side of the sidewalk, if one exists, or back or curb or edge of road. All areas are different and require different treatment. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| I think the ability to have a 3 car garage in Richmond is essential. These are not inexpensive properties and neighbourhoods and people paying these prices for homes will require a 3 car garage. The value of properties that do not accommodate a 3 car garage will be significantly reduced. | |
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | |
| As long as the measurement point for the neighbourhood street is taken from a higher point and not the lowest. More information is needed to make judgment on this point. | |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| The proposed changes might be helpful in a neighbourhood untouched by re development... if such a neighbourhood exists.? However, problems will occur in neighbourhoods, like mine, where new homes have been constructed (sometimes on both sides of an existing older home) according to the previous generous bylaw. The "remainder" parcel will be significantly handicapped by the new bylaw and will actually be the odd home on the block. This will serve to reduce the value of the homes of long term residents. While I am a developer, I do not develop in the City of Richmond. I have lived in Richmond my entire life. I do own my home at [REDACTED] and expect that if this bylaw is not carefully considered the value of my home and the value of many others will be significantly reduced. | |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca Word of mouth |



Respondent No: 293

Login: Steven D

Responded Feb 10, 2017 11:42:27 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 294

Login: KDub

Responded Feb 10, 2017 12:21:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 295

Responded Feb 10, 2017 12:27:09 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 296

Login: Sthaker

Responded Feb 10, 2017 13:33:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It is ridiculous to change the current zoning bylaw for single family homes. The majority of old homes have been redeveloped and it would destroy the character already established in almost every neighbourhood. The only thing that I support is the gate openings for single family homes on MAIN ARTERIAL ROADS as it is a hazard for cars. No gates should be allowed or they should be pushed back on the MAIN ARTERIAL ROADS. Other than that, all other options that the City is considering is not viable from a builders perspective. First off, property values will drop for all single family homes. Secondly, this is an additional cost added on to the builder that will eventually be shifted on to the buyer. It does not make sense to make changes to a zoning bylaw that has been in place for well over 20 years. Please reconsider this as it will drive away small builders from Richmond and will also ruin the design and beauty of single family homes. The neighbourhoods will be destroyed and there will be no way to fix them.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 297

Responded Feb 10, 2017 13:55:48 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Do you want the city to develop?
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 298

Responded Feb 10, 2017 13:58:11 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
There are different lot shapes.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Current requirement is sufficient. No point to Amend it.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
No many accessory buildings.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Deck Location is up to the direction of house and sunlight. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Current site coverage is already small. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | It is fine to have two trees. Is there limitation for what kind of trees? |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: There is limitation for some lots to have front yard. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: It should be up to the lot shape and lot size. No point to restrict it. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Need to look into this. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 299

Responded Feb 10, 2017 14:04:23 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 300

Login: JQ

Responded Feb 10, 2017 14:45:48 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I point is that as long as the front and rear setbacks requirement is met, please respect the home owners' right regarding how to design and build the house. In terms of compatibility issue, it is a really subjective matter. My point is that while some property with great historical value should be preserved, it is the new buildings that make the community look better and fresh not the aging buildings.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I don't understand why the home owners need to be instructed where to install the gate on his own land. I point is that as long as the front and rear setbacks requirement is met, please respect the home owners' right regarding how to design and build the house. In terms of compatibility issue, it is a really subjective matter. My point is that while some property with great historical value should be preserved, it is the new buildings that make the community look better and fresh not the aging buildings.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Homeowners should have right to build garages that meet their needs. I point is that as long as the front and rear setbacks requirement is met, please respect the home owners' right regarding how to design and build the house. In terms of compatibility issue, it is a really subjective matter. My point is that while some property with great historical value should be preserved, it is the new buildings that make the community look better and fresh not the aging buildings.

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** No Opinion

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I point is that as long as the front and rear setbacks requirement is met, please respect the home owners' right regarding how to design and build the house. In terms of compatibility issue, it is a really subjective matter. My point is that while some property with great historical value should be preserved, it is the new buildings that make the community look better and fresh not the aging buildings.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 301

Responded Feb 10, 2017 14:48:35 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 302

Login: TIMK

Responded Feb 10, 2017 15:21:32 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43. **Please specify:**

I sold my property in Vancouver and going to build my house in Richmond this year.

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 303

Login: Lewis

Responded Feb 10, 2017 15:39:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 304

Login: Lulu2007

Responded Feb 10, 2017 15:42:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 305

Login: Jays

Responded Feb 10, 2017 15:59:51 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 306

Login: Happyqw99

Responded Feb 10, 2017 16:09:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Facebook



Respondent No: 307

Login: Justine

Responded Feb 10, 2017 17:42:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 308

Responded Feb 10, 2017 17:50:36 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 309

Login: Westp

Responded Feb 10, 2017 18:03:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: The best option would be to eliminate gates and wall. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Nobody really needs a 3 car garage and a paved area to accommodate an additional 8 parked cars. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: New building heights have really gotten out of hand. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 310

Login: dlccheng

Responded Feb 10, 2017 18:18:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 311

Responded Feb 10, 2017 18:38:53 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 312

Login: Heidi

Responded Feb 10, 2017 18:50:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 313

Login: Somiya

Responded Feb 10, 2017 23:01:26 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Richmond Houses are unique with excellent innovative designed homes, lets keep the status quo to allow Richmond to be identified as most preferred living city in Metro Vancouver.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Changing setback will limit the house design and constructions options. In 2015 city has already changed roof height to pacify demands of community. Changing any more bylaw will make all most new homes non attractive to any buyer and will be detrimental to construction related business.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Changing setback will make all houses to be smaller and unattractive for any potential buyer.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| This issue was much covered in changes made in sept 2015. No further change is required in this case. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Most houses in Richmond are designed to have maximum privacy for neighbour. This should be treated on case to case basis. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| current 30% green area is sufficient to keep house look good as well fully utilizable. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Already so many thefts are happening in all neighbourhood. Most goes unreported to police. So house security is must for any living family. No gates does not imply that I can force my neighbour to talk to me. It is all personal and gates have never been a problem ever.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

current status is good to allow house to have 3 car garage. Without in-house parking our roads will be full of parked cars.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

Q40.Comments:

Changes made in Sept 2015 has taken care of this issue and should roof line should not be reduced any further.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Lets find ways to make Richmond more Richer and unique rather than destroying it based on few disgruntled complaints.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Other

Q43.Please specify:

Have lived in Richmond and seeing it growing. I would like city to think ways to help better houses .

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 314

Login: Bo

Responded Feb 10, 2017 23:37:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 315

Login: Kanon

Responded Feb 11, 2017 00:29:38 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 316

Login: Nonplus

Responded Feb 11, 2017 01:18:03 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Any change of rules need to look after all people being impacted. For small lots less than 4500 square feet, , further limiting the massing will leave very limited options for design. Compared to other city's more flexible regulation, this will destroy the property value of the land in Richmond.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

In determine major issues affecting all residents, Richmond City Council should make sure majority number of residents are partipating the survey to conclude any meaningful result. We should avoid a small number of loud voices overwhelming the majority quiet residents because they are less active or not aware of what's going on.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|---|---------------|



Respondent No: 317

Login: gbg003

Responded Feb 11, 2017 01:40:18 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 318

Login: Francis

Responded Feb 11, 2017 05:28:33 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 319

Responded Feb 11, 2017 07:17:16 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 320

Login: zheng

Responded Feb 11, 2017 09:32:51 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 321

Login: Rose

Responded Feb 11, 2017 12:30:07 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Suggest a sliding scale used for different lot sizes. Important objective: maximize green space and have it embedded in development applications.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

How does Richmond compare to other cities? Increased setbacks would leave room for retention of mature trees. Because of flood plain requirements, Richmond loses more trees than other cities through the development process. We need to compensate for this by increasing setbacks (Richmond's current setbacks are the smallest of neighbouring cities). Let's have Richmond be a leader in keeping our neighbourhoods green.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Let's not shade out our neighbours.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: I'm shocked that projections have been allowed on both sides of houses. Surely this is a fire hazard? I understand that for fire safety 5 feet should be allowed between house and property line (10 feet between houses). With projections, the space between houses is only 4 feet. I believe that fire safety should be an important factor in completely disallowing any side yard projections. I can't see any benefit to neighbourhoods. Plus larger (5 feet) side yard setbacks could facilitate more retention of trees. Currently, trees are not only being lost on developed properties; neighbouring properties are losing side yard trees as well. This does not make for good neighbourhood relations. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments People should have some privacy in their back yards. Having decks overlooking a neighbour's yard is not fair. Let's show some respect for the privacy of our neighbours. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |

Q23.Comments:

I would prefer more green space than the options show. Current 3 and 4 projecting garages are responsible for the significant loss of trees and lack of green space. Too much space is taken for both the garage and for driver accessibility to the garage. I've noticed in my neighbourhood that the front yards become private parking lots, which is neighbourhood unfriendly. We lose mature trees to space for parking cars. This is not environmentally sustainable and makes for bleak landscapes.

Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. Yes

Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits not answered

Q26.Comments:

Suggest native to BC species and incentives to plant larger species of trees. Currently most trees planted are decorative miniature species or non-native species. Richmond has a great Ecological Network Management Strategy: we already know that native to BC species are what we should be doing.

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. Yes

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

Please get rid of 3 and 4 garages and we will have more green space. Projecting garages are not environmentally sustainable. They are responsible for killing too many trees in Richmond. Homes should not be fortresses; they should be part of a larger community. For example, 3 car garage homes (with only decorative trees, if any) being built on my street are across from a well treed park. Everyone wants to look at a tree but few want to plant one. If we don't leave space for trees, and enough space for some trees that grow big, then we will never have any on these properties that do not currently factor in ecology to their development plans.

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

Why does Richmond need to be gated? I believe gates are not neighbourly—and that they create ghettos instead of vibrant neighbourhoods. (I've heard at council that it may be impossible to disallow them?). If we must have gates, yes, move them well back onto the property and encourage or mandate the planting of trees and shrubs on the larger boulevard. This would negate the bleakness of the gated look and give back to neighbourhoods in a positive way. This could be a real winning formula! Great idea.

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. Yes

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

Eliminate 3 or 4 car projecting garages. Allow only garages that call for straight ahead drive in.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

I'm quite concerned about privacy and loss of sunlight due to overly high houses (built too close to property lines).

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Changes need to take place. I'm pleased that efforts appear to be underway to make some of those changes. Good luck!

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 322

Login: Sz

Responded Feb 11, 2017 13:44:57 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Since there are minimum front and back setbacks, the maximum depth of the house has no need to be changed.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

The entry gate should guard the front yard, otherwise it's pointless.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 323

Login: JMM

Responded Feb 11, 2017 14:13:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| option 3 Fire Safety access needed | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| I support option 2 | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| I support option 3. Houses in Richmond are far too large and take up too much lot size to the detriment of surrounding houses. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I support option 2 | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am in favour of restricting the size of the houses in Richmond. The current overbuilding of mega houses is ruining neighbourhoods in Richmond. I do not want them to take up the entire lot size and to build too close to other houses. Many houses are being dwarfed by these mega houses and the older homes are built lower depth and have problems with drainage from the height of the lots.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 324

Login: Gail2

Responded Feb 11, 2017 15:16:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 325

Login: sw1gr8guy

Responded Feb 11, 2017 16:24:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Twitter



Respondent No: 326
Login: 30 year resident

Responded Feb 11, 2017 19:50:23 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Stop disgraceful monster houses encroaching on previous irreplaceable farmland.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Choose Option 3
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Choose Option 2
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Choose Option 3 | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Choose Option 2 | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Choose Option 3 | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: Choose option 2 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Choose Option 3 | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Choose Option 2 | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Choose Option 4 | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Stay with current method | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Stop disgraceful monster houses encroaching on previous irreplaceable farmland. We are destroying Richmond with short-sighted money-in-pocket priorities and causing irreversible damage to our rich land.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 327

Responded Feb 11, 2017 20:33:42 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The change will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and limited the house design, we are multicultural and we need variety house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The change will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and limited the house design, we are multicultural and we need variety house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

Side yard changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and significant limited the house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

Side yard changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and significant limited the house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q19.Comments

People like variety houses, all house limited to same, so boring and nobody like it, we are multicultural and we need variety house design, changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and limited the house design, Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

Changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and significant limited the house design. People like variety houses, all house limited to same, so boring and nobody like it, we are multicultural and we need variety house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. Yes

Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits not answered

Q26.Comments:

Changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and significant limited the house design. People like variety houses, all house limited to same, so boring and nobody like it, we are multicultural and we need variety house design. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) not answered

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

Changes will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and significant limited the house design. Any changes finally will effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. No

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

Option 2 is ridiculous, no one like it. Option 1 limited gate design, all gates is same, so boring.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

This is the worst idea, no one acceptable. When a car try 90 degree turn into gate which closed front wall, for the safety reason, need some extra space (some how more than 3 feet), otherwise car may hit front wall. 1. Option 2 is only for 2 cars not for 3 cars, especially if there is porches. 2. Option 3 is only for 2, no porches possibility. 3. Option 4 is only for 1 car, plus porches possibility. Peoples lives in a single house, normally is big family, at least 4 people or more, and normal have 3 cars or more, so will those cars parking? parking on street? or parking to City hall? This change will significant effect the house value and serious strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Building high will limited roof slope, we just see winter snow is so heavy in past few days and last December, safety issue, no need change current bylaw. Any change will be limited the house design, finally effect the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Board 17 - Garage Projections is the worst option, I am strongly against it. All changes (except 2 trees) will be serious effect FAR floor area ratio, and limited the house design, finally effect significant the house value and strike motivation of builder, and then, Nobody buy, nobody built, city will be no permit fee and other constructions incomes, is this City hopes?

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond builder/developer |
|--|------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 328

Login: Jackson

Responded Feb 11, 2017 22:31:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 329

Login: happy1818

Responded Feb 11, 2017 22:36:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 330

Login: GH

Responded Feb 12, 2017 00:01:52 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This amendment is ridiculous and impractical. I am strongly against the proposal for the suggested amendment.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 331

Responded Feb 12, 2017 09:03:12 am

- | | |
|--|--|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | Yes |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | Yes |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | Yes |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 332

Login: Mib100

Responded Feb 12, 2017 10:12:27 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 333

Login: kaikai

Responded Feb 12, 2017 11:39:49 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 334

Login: kerry

Responded Feb 12, 2017 13:18:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 335

Login: Tommy2260

Responded Feb 12, 2017 13:45:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 336

Login: thomas3488

Responded Feb 12, 2017 13:53:18 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 337

Login: Amy218

Responded Feb 12, 2017 13:53:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 338

Login: Sams

Responded Feb 12, 2017 14:47:34 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 339

Login: DG

Responded Feb 12, 2017 15:02:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 340
Login: XIAOCONGMINGYU

Responded Feb 12, 2017 15:51:32 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 341

Login: L Qin

Responded Feb 12, 2017 16:46:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 342

Login: longriver

Responded Feb 12, 2017 16:58:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 343

Login: flamy

Responded Feb 12, 2017 19:29:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 344

Login: Sallymander

Responded Feb 12, 2017 19:56:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 345

Login: hua

Responded Feb 12, 2017 20:15:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am against the changes of building mass because 1) The land use contract just halted not too long ago, and with many new houses built or in construction already in the neighborhood, the proposed much strict rules will create two tiers of home owners, those already have a three story massive house, or those can't even comfortable build a large two stories. The land will worth very differently as well, which is unfair to people who didn't rebuild in recent years. 2) From architecture stand point, the proposal will impact owners with small land much more than those with larger land, which is unfair as well. Overall, I am against the city changing the policies too quickly and too extremely.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 346

Login: jelder

Responded Feb 13, 2017 10:57:42 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Do not allow the conversion of garage space, partially or completely, to living space after occupancy permit is issued. Property line retaining walls that face a street must be constructed of reinforced concrete and at best should be faced with stone or brick whether or not a fence is installed on top of it. The wood retaining walls constructed of horizontal 4"X 6" garden ties are ugly and are temporary and will not last more than 20 years and as well they warp and deviate from vertical sometimes even before the house is completed.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 347

Login: Navi

Responded Feb 13, 2017 11:51:16 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 348

Login: Gurjeet

Responded Feb 13, 2017 11:53:20 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 349

Login: S123

Responded Feb 13, 2017 11:56:16 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 350

Login: K123

Responded Feb 13, 2017 12:00:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 351

Login: Sparky

Responded Feb 13, 2017 12:04:51 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

not answered

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The maximum overall continuous length of wall, including any offsets or protrusions, should be limited to 50% of the total lot depth.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

not answered

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

All residential class 01 must have the same setback, 7.5 metres.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

not answered

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Accessory Buildings greater than 10 sq. m. should not be allowed in Residential Class 01 areas. If allowed, the building setbacks should be 2 metres from the side and 6 metres from the rear and connected to the house roof drainage system to prevent spilling rainwater unto the adjacent lots.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: No projections should be allowed into the sideyards. This causing difficulties for fire and ambulance events not to mention roof and gutter maintenance. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Second floor decks should not be permitted as they intrude on the rear privacy of the adjacent lots especially where there is mixed zoning in a neighbourhood or if the lots are at right angles to one another. Beside they are a maintenance issue and a source of leaks into the lower level. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| If you own a rancher, trees are a big issue. Trees belong in the boulevard away from the house. Trees can crack foundations, drainage piping, and cause gutters to clog. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q40.Comments:

Overall building height is the greater of height above finished grade or the highest crown of the roads surrounding the house. What about corner lots/lanes/etc.? A volume constraint should be included with the height constraint. See below.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Single Family Building Massing, House designs complying to vertical building envelope regulations introduced with zoning amendments September 2015 - Example 2, Board 20 from the open house. After the footprint and setbacks have been established the building volume should be specified to control the height of the structure. This additional constraint allows for 10 or 12 foot ceiling heights but constrains the overall height of the structure thus reducing the massing effect we now experience.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|---|---------------|



Respondent No: 352

Login: Davinder

Responded Feb 13, 2017 12:21:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 353

Login: Arny

Responded Feb 13, 2017 12:53:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 354

Login: miguo

Responded Feb 13, 2017 12:53:41 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 355

Login: YY

Responded Feb 13, 2017 15:09:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 356

Login: twoshoes

Responded Feb 13, 2017 16:13:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 357

Login: rosehill

Responded Feb 13, 2017 16:36:34 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Too much house in single family areas make for a cramped non green look
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Second storey decks eliminate privacy - especially in an area with no lanes |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: we should see green space not garages | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 358

Login: yuping

Responded Feb 13, 2017 17:16:00 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 359

Login: kn

Responded Feb 13, 2017 19:34:00 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Limit house depth to 40% or less to go back to having a more naturally pleasing balance between house and green space (front and rear yard). Having and preserving green space, be it lawn, trees, plants, within each lot is much more preferable to maximizing building and man made space otherwise will end up with a barren cityscape.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Not enough with any of the options. Make it easily long enough to have a rear yard where kids can easily play or family can enjoy spending time outside at home.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Strongly suggest Option 3 of no gate being allowed. Gates help create the environment of a closed community and discourage positive interactions with neighbours. The opposite of what Richmond has been for a long time. Also, the presence of gates could increase crime, not decrease or prevent them.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 360

Login: HUI

Responded Feb 13, 2017 19:43:12 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 361

Login: visser

Responded Feb 13, 2017 19:48:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 362

Login: REXXU

Responded Feb 13, 2017 19:49:10 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 363

Login: zcxia68

Responded Feb 13, 2017 20:53:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 364

Responded Feb 13, 2017 22:01:44 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 365

Login: ken1999

Responded Feb 13, 2017 23:05:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 366

Login: John11112222

Responded Feb 13, 2017 23:58:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
It is our freedom to choose what our houses should look like. Not you.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 367

Login: fuluanke

Responded Feb 14, 2017 09:16:05 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 368

Login: oaktree

Responded Feb 14, 2017 11:26:46 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 369

Responded Feb 14, 2017 11:37:25 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 370

Login: taoyuan

Responded Feb 14, 2017 15:40:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 371

Login: DougG

Responded Feb 14, 2017 16:38:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 372

Login: Jasmeet

Responded Feb 14, 2017 19:03:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 373

Responded Feb 14, 2017 20:28:15 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

It's nice to have more houses with more design elements. Not just long , rectangular 29Ft walls.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

By restricting the size of the setbacks of new construction The City is making new houses smaller and less desirable. The market will respond by paying more money for existing homes that maximize the current building bylaw. Moreover, any house that is considered as lot value will be seen as less desirable as a builder will be restricted with the size of home they can build. In turn, they will pay less for this "lot value" home. An approval of an increased set-back will devalue a large segment of homes.

Q10.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: The City should leave the projection as is, or not have the projection at all. A small projection that is only 2 ft wide and 6 ft long is odd | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: How will the City regulate the upkeep of all this landscaping? Unless the city is prepared to hand out fines for unkept landscaping, The City should not enforce a bylaw that forces home owners into larger landscaped areas. Moreover, how will the City protect the neighbours from unsightly yards from vacant owners? | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| A property owner should not be forced to have live landscaping. There are eclectic landscaping designs the are very attractive that do not use live plants. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| | Other |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Q43. Please specify: | Realtor |
|-----------------------------|---------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 374

Login: Brian

Responded Feb 14, 2017 22:00:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 375

Login: Jackzhao

Responded Feb 14, 2017 22:09:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 376

Login: Zhang

Responded Feb 14, 2017 22:40:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 377

Login: mike_a

Responded Feb 14, 2017 22:42:18 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 378
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 08:55:20 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 379
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 08:57:28 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% only
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: prefer no gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Amy Wong

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 380
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 08:59:34 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% of total depth preferred.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Daniel Chan

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 381
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:01:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% preferred
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Lisa Ling

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 382
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:04:34 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% only
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Kitty Chan

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 383
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:06:37 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Lower than 9m | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Simon Pang

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 384
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:09:13 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: lower than 9 m | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Mann S. Chiang My email address: mannchiang@yahoo.ca

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 385
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:11:36 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 386
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:13:42 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 387
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:17:55 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Wayne Cromie

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 388
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:21:28 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates please. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Prefer less than 9 m! | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Ann Tong

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 389
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:23:33 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates please | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 390
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:26:39 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Should be lower than 9m | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 391
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:28:40 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates please | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 392
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:30:18 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% better
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Better no gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 393
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:32:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Should be 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: lower than 9 metre | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 394
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:34:27 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% of total depth
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 395
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:36:21 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% total depth
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 396
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:39:00 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% of lot
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: My e-mail address is:

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 397
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:40:44 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% is better
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 398
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 15, 2017 09:42:37 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% of total depth
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 399

Responded Feb 15, 2017 10:26:56 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 400

Login: lenn

Responded Feb 15, 2017 12:22:19 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

It's a god damn free hold of land and the owner has the right to design their own dream house. If he/she doesn't like the backyard and he/she totally has the right to do so. Do not put your personal opinion towards all property owners. That's bs, selfish, short-sited and stupid.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

same as above

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

mind some other business please. nothing is wrong with the current code

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.**Comments:**

Q27.**I support an amendment to the Zoning** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below)** not answered

Q29.**Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements** not answered

Q30.**Comments:**

not answered

Q31.**I support an amendment to the Zoning** No
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.

Q32.**Board 16 - Entry Gates** not answered

Q33.**Comments:**

Q34.**I support an amendment to the Zoning** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below)** not answered

Q36.**Board 17 - Garage Projections** not answered

Q37.**Comments:**

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning** No (retain status quo)
Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.Please specify:

i dont even live in richmond but I just think this proposal
is stupid.

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 401

Login: Yuxin

Responded Feb 15, 2017 12:54:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 402

Login: V

Responded Feb 15, 2017 16:04:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 403

Login: martin2004

Responded Feb 15, 2017 17:21:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 404

Login: Hunter

Responded Feb 16, 2017 04:46:04 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 405

Login: Richard2017

Responded Feb 16, 2017 04:56:43 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 406

Login: syncmaster1

Responded Feb 16, 2017 08:42:07 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Eliminate all front wall and gates for an open community. No Walled Compunds | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Space (sq ft) is more important than volume. There is no need for wasteful 10 ft plus ceilings using up more of our resources. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond is becoming a city of excess.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 407

Login: carrie

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:05:14 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
please keep it the same
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 408
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:26:02 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Current bylaw is sufficient.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Has not been an issue thus far.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
What is the big deal
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Where and how big a deck should be my choice. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Makes sense |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Fine as is. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Why not status quo label here. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: My choice is 1, 2, 3 or 10. Less regulations please. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please don't only listen to WARP'D view group. We all live in the city of Richmond.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 409
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:27:58 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 410
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:30:33 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I support current bylaw, retain status quo. As an asia family, we stay together with parents and our kids. We usually have big family and we need bigger place to stay as a family. The car garage is necessary and a yard can park extra cars.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 411
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:33:27 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Remain the same with status quo. My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

(Heard about this on Chinese Radio)

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

A Richmond resident

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation

process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 412
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:35:52 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My email address is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 413
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:37:54 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 414
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:40:05 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: John My e-mail address is: [REDACTED] (Heard about this on the radio)

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 415
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:44:25 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED] (Heard about this on Wechat)

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 416
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:46:22 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 417
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:48:43 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Remain the same with status quo. My name is: My e-mail is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 418
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:52:08 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Min 30% | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 419
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 11:55:27 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

No change, remain status quo. My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 420
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 16, 2017 12:00:54 pm
At:



Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

limiting the depth of the house makes it difficult to fully use the allowable FAR to its fullest as the side vertical envelopes do restrict the 2nd floor plate.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

This is another setback in house design making it difficult in placing the interior rooms efficiently within the house.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

This is designed to restrict L-shaped garage projection - what about if the garage is situated for front loading (straight on) - does this apply?

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

The building height should be measured from top of slab or floor just if there is a crawl space - its the envelope lines that need to be re-looked at.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

Other

Q43.Please specify:

Residential House Design

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 421

Responded Feb 16, 2017 12:50:07 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 422

Login: Niti

Responded Feb 16, 2017 14:10:17 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I think long continuous walls at a 4 foot(1.2 m) side yard setback create shadowing of neighboring homes and gardens. This wall can be five meters tall (or taller). If its length is not controlled it can box in the neighbor especially if there are more than one such homes on either side of an older home. I think this design feature will even start impacting newer bigger homes pretty soon as the older home stock is being monopolized to build mega homes, but by then it will be too late to protest. Any trees or gardens in this side yard space is doomed even for the neighbor.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I think this change is most needed and tying the rear yard setback to lot depth seems fair rather than assign an arbitrary number because lots in Richmond have a variety of depths. The backyards is where the maximum damage is for the neighbors in terms of a sense of separation, loss of light and loss of privacy. This loss is exacerbated when any hedges, shrubs as well as significant trees are cut in the backyard. Even canopy overhangs from the neighbor are being pruned mercilessly. What makes this problem "hidden" is that it is hard to peek into someone's backyard. The homes being built today are much taller, deeper and wider, even after the overall height was reduced to 29.5 feet. The backyard is probably the only patch of green left in the newer mega homes if it escapes being paved over or assigned to an accessory building. Even beautiful big homes seem to leave only a pocket sized backyard. Building trends have shown that unless the city mandates this change through its building bylaws, the builders will keep maximizing the house footprint even though family sizes in Canada have been shrinking for decades now.

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| Q10. | I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | Yes |
| Q11. | Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. | Comments: If a homeowner or builder needs to put in a larger than 10 square foot accessory building its height and maximum size should be controlled and it should be further away from the boundary walls than just the minimum setback. This ensures that if the structure is too large or too tall, the cost of it is not being invisibly passed onto the neighbor by impacting privacy or access to light in a neighboring home or garden. | |
| Q13. | I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. | If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. | Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. | Comments: The side yard setback for Richmond (at 4 feet/1.2 m) is already quite small, especially since the exterior boundary wall of the home under the current bylaw is quite tall (5 meters or more) . There is no justifiable reason for eating into this side yard. Walking around my neighborhood I have seen many projections into side yards and almost all are totally avoidable. | |
| Q17. | I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. | Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. | Comments Privacy problems for neighbors have become substantial with tall wide homes being built without sufficient or any green screening (hedges, trees) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| <p>If we look closely at what is being pulled out of older lots and what is being put back in, especially in areas defined as setbacks and near property boundaries; we will see that what is being uprooted are trees, shrubs ,hedges and any other possible green plantings/grass. What is being put back in are paved driveways, accessory buildings, walkways and paved patios. While it is important for people to have a place to park their car and enjoy their yard on a patio; if you examine the scale of this turnaround, you may be dismayed. Projections for 3-car garages and paved driveways in the front yard setback and accessory buildings in the backyard hardly leave any 'yard' to enjoy. Since this trend is excessive, I believe it is time to mandate a smaller lot coverage and clearly mandate more live plantings. This will also reduce water run off and in this time of climate change homeowners and builders should be asked to make environmentally sound choices. You can still build big luxurious homes with 40% lot coverage. Within the existing bylaw about 500 square feet of garage space and 10 square feet of accessory building are already given "free" to homeowners and builders without this contributing to the lot coverage percentage , To give perspective to what 500 square feet might mean: It can be a 20 feet by 20 feet garage and still have 10 square feet of room for storage left in this garage. That is a lot of room for storage and parking , If someone wants more it should come out of their lot percentage. Increasing requirement for green landscaping and trees is very much needed because trees are being cut on private property at an alarming rate without much thought to any long term neighborhood planning or assessment of negative cumulative impacts of removing trees lot by lot.. Single family lots are perhaps the only place left on private property where we still have room to retain trees. Losing trees to densification of neighborhoods can still be partially justified, but losing trees to massification of single family homes seems totally pointless</p> | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Trees are being cut down on private property even as the city scrambles to re-plant trees on public lands. Neighborhoods need green live plantings and trees. The positive effects of the presence of trees are clearly documented and the negative impacts of an absence of trees are also already quite visible in Richmond in neighborhoods like Broadmoor. Trees are our benevolent guardians and even though they bring work and expense related to pruning and maintenance; they connect us to nature, bring birds and bees into our yards and connect us to the ebb and flow of seasons..

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

The trend today in Richmond is to cover the front yard with garage projections and large driveways leaving barely a patch of green.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I think it is fair to ask the homeowner/builder to setback gates 6m from the front property line to prevent traffic backup on the street. That way if there is a desire or individual preference for fences and gates, there are less spillover costs to the neighborhood and community.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

I would prefer to totally avoid garage projections into the front yard; however if people really do want to project into the front yard for a garage, I will choose option 4 . Even though it is the strictest option it allows for two car garages. If we as a city are serious about mass transit options we shouldn't be paving the way for new homes to build three car garages . In addition, allowing 3-car garage projections, really negatively impacts neighbors in two specific ways. It pushes the house footprint way back in the lot and shrinks the backyard substantially creating privacy and tree retention issues both in the front yard and the backyard. Also for the neighbor, the tall exterior house wall in conjunction with the garage projection makes a much longer 'alley of darkness' in the neighbor's side yard.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

This change is much needed as this refers to the how site grade is measured for new homes which are often built 2-3 feet above neighboring properties. This ends up flooding the yards of surrounding properties and this problem is neither an easy nor cheap fix for the neighbor. As we all know, it does rain a lot on the west coast!

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I feel that there is an urgent need for mandating a new kind of "dream home" in Richmond: One that is more cognizant of its impact on the neighbors, the community and the environment. This does not mean that you cannot build big. In fact an effort to retain mature trees and building homes to coexist with neighbors will only lead to a more harmonious design so that dreams of people can coexist. I would like to point out that all these options primarily refer to changes to the exterior of the lot and what should be clearly addressed in the building bylaws with reference to what is currently happening in the setbacks around the new homes. The building bylaw needs to tame a trend of excesses in design of new single family homes so that diverse homes and choices can exist peacefully side by side. Shrinking lot coverage to 40% and mandating more live green building space is very much needed to reduce this trend of massification, especially since an earlier attempt to count double height spaces at 12.1 feet was rejected by the council. Changes that allow for backyard privacy and relate the size of the backyard as a percentage of lot depth and prohibit any projections into side yard are desperately needed. Measuring site grade differently(question 18) will significant relief from flooding in yards of older homes by neighboring new-builds. Minimizing front yard garage projections will help with retention of mature trees and with requiring new homes to be build in a way that minimizes environmental costs such as run off from overtly paved setbacks.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family A Richmond resident
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 423

Login: Ladysasha

Responded Feb 16, 2017 14:50:56 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 424

Login: 3231Bowen

Responded Feb 16, 2017 17:54:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 425

Login: Richpro8

Responded Feb 16, 2017 17:55:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please stop ugly monster houses in Richmond.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 426

Login: Jeetie

Responded Feb 16, 2017 18:33:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Why make changes when the majority of people are content with the present rules and regulations

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Word of mouth |
|--|----------------------------------|



Respondent No: 427

Login: psandhu5

Responded Feb 16, 2017 18:55:07 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Why restrict maximum depth? I do not see the logic
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: The owner should be able to make his own choice. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It appears that a small minority is having significant influence on City Council. As a resident of Richmond this is a concern.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 428
Login: Looking Forward

Responded Feb 16, 2017 19:04:00 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 429

Login: misscyc

Responded Feb 16, 2017 22:30:50 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 430

Login: johnny

Responded Feb 16, 2017 23:49:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook

Twitter



Respondent No: 431

Login: Schoy

Responded Feb 17, 2017 10:10:29 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 432
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 17, 2017 10:34:02 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 433
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 17, 2017 10:40:05 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Vancouver has larger setback b/c they allow 3 storey homes. Rear yard setback are enough, 6m is good! Extra landscaping at back Property Line is a way to address. 3 car garage is an important element for my home and my life style. Need 3 car garage. Need flexibility to design the houses. Please don't restrict us. This is desirable and people love them. If you want to do these changes, do it neighbourhood by neighbourhood. We hate this changes again and again. Need gate and fences for security and privacy of my family. Fireplace and Dining Room Hutches are important and permitted by BC Building Code and is allowed in other municipalities. 83% of Broadmoor Properties are developed already with 3 car garages and @ 6m backyard setback. Houses being build for past 30 years in same way. Why change it now. No change. Status quo.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 434
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 17, 2017 10:41:34 am

At:



- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Paul Atwal

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 435

Login: Ed

Responded Feb 17, 2017 13:44:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 436

Login: dsz

Responded Feb 17, 2017 17:23:20 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Twitter



Respondent No: 437

Login: kenny

Responded Feb 17, 2017 22:45:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 438

Login: nampo

Responded Feb 18, 2017 00:04:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Option 1
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Option 1
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Option 1
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Option 1 | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Option 1 | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: No change | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: Option 1 | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Option 1 | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Option 1 | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Option1 | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: No change preferred | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 439

Login: Peanut

Responded Feb 18, 2017 11:17:14 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 440

Login: F.lam

Responded Feb 18, 2017 14:19:00 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 441

Login: Tripper

Responded Feb 18, 2017 14:43:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q19.Comments

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q26.Comments:

City provides a list of the type of trees that are suitable .

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer Option two | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 442

Login: Bill6

Responded Feb 18, 2017 17:33:20 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 443

Login: Oshowy

Responded Feb 19, 2017 15:38:28 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I have lived in 3 neighbourhoods in 35 years in Richmond. From buying our first small rancher in early 1980's, to the home we raised our family in thru elementary school, to our existing home now. It is disappointing and sad how few of our neighbours we know now. And the ones we do know have been long time Richmond residents for years.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Monster houses demoralize the flavour of our family neighbourhoods.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Particularly if large bushes and shrubs have been "destroyed" during demo minimum 2 trees to be required planted. And low growing bushes and shrubs too.

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

not answered

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

Option 2.

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

I would like to see a limit of 2 car garage on smaller lots and only 3 car permitted if over a certain size. Far too much "garage" size in the newer homes. Don't fit existing neighbourhood theme.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

Speaks again to the monster-style homes being permitted in long time existing neighbourhoods, with no regard to the existing themes/styles. They look out of place and dwarf original homes. I'm not against new homes, but why do they have to be so large and often under-utilized.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I live in Broadmoor and moved here from East Richmond 10+ years ago. This is our 3rd home in Richmond in 30+ years. The home next door to us is well maintained however the residents live in Taiwan and visit only for about 3-4 weeks each summer. On the other side the resident moved in 50+ years ago and we have each other for dinner regularly. Thank god!

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 444

Responded Feb 19, 2017 17:00:05 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 445

Login: hervieux

Responded Feb 19, 2017 17:32:58 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 446

Login: RLynn

Responded Feb 19, 2017 18:30:58 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 447

Responded Feb 19, 2017 20:55:53 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 448

Login: VickiVicki

Responded Feb 20, 2017 13:23:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 449

Login: Joyce

Responded Feb 20, 2017 14:24:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 450

Login: Robery

Responded Feb 20, 2017 16:16:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer
Other

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 451

Login: Oshowy Family

Responded Feb 20, 2017 16:49:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Our neighbourhood are changing and not necessarily in a positive way. I understand old homes eventually come down, but rebuilding something more in line with existing neighbourhoods, rather than monster houses should be achievable. Why do the homes have to be so much larger ?

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 452
Login: stevestonpackers

Responded Feb 20, 2017 17:28:03 pm
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I actually think the front gates should be banned as they place barriers to a neighborhood development and communication. my neighbor gates is always open as the space from the garage to where the gate closes is to small for his vehicle. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 453

Responded Feb 20, 2017 21:30:49 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 454
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 21, 2017 08:17:55 am

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

not answered

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

'0' setback for accessory buildings.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| Mini. 6 m side yards with .6 m projection brick fireplace only. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No setback gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 455
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 21, 2017 08:19:16 am
At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 456
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 21, 2017 08:21:20 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I don't agree with a small number of people being able to control how things should run in Richmond.
Personally, if I am paying to build a house I should have full say in how I want it.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

**Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook



Respondent No: 457
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 21, 2017 08:23:28 am

At:

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No opinion |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No Opinion |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No Opinion |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is:

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify: not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 458

Login: DBRichmond

Responded Feb 21, 2017 09:14:40 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 459

Login: CKJuan

Responded Feb 21, 2017 12:13:02 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Current monster homes are ridiculously large and cause removal of all trees. There are no front, side nor backyards and any remaining tiny land that's left is concreted. New regulations should reflect green guidelines as well as buildable area. Minimum trees, grass, shrubs etc. Also need to addressed are the unsightly fencing and gates. Trees should be enforced as privacy separations rather than brick or wood fence with gates.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

See above.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

See above

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Currently many newer (within 10 years) monster homes already take up full yard. Those that have projections don't allow for any spaces left. This creates clutter and unsightly garbage gathered at most houses where rodents infestation can be a problem. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Many monster homes have unnecessary unsightly second story decks that are not used nor usable. Builders are just frivolously tacking on unnecessary extras to try and make another fast buck. This has got to stop since the neighbourhoods are starting to look ridiculous. Also, creating so much wastage unnecessarily. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Yes, Richmond needs more trees. Too many have been cut down for driveways and ridiculous sized homes. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: There needs to be at least 1 trees per bedroom of house or 2 per washroom or 3 per car garage. 1 or 2 trees can't begin to bring back what has been cut down in the past 10 years. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Yes as much landscape as possible. Too many are just driveways now. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |

Q37.Comments:

Number and size of garages should be limited. This will in return limit the size and number of gas guzzling vehicles. If intention is storage, sheds should be used but limited in number and size.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 460

Login: byu

Responded Feb 21, 2017 13:40:14 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q19.Comments

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------|
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
|---|------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 461

Responded Feb 21, 2017 15:37:21 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I don't like 3 cars garage at the front of house. it is ugly. not too much area for grass, trees or flowers etc. too much area for drive way in the front yard

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
|--|------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

I want to plant 3 trees at the area (it belongs City of Richmond) where is between sidewalk and street. I sent email to city of Richmond and went to City hall and called Richmond government and tried to get approval. but nobody can tell me who is taking care of that. I will pay money for the trees. where can I get approval to plant 3 trees at the front of my yard?

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|---|-----------------|



Respondent No: 462

Login: Francine

Responded Feb 21, 2017 20:03:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 463

Login: edient

Responded Feb 21, 2017 20:38:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 464

Login: Savin

Responded Feb 22, 2017 09:52:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 465
Login: happygirl520530

Responded Feb 22, 2017 10:29:35 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 466

Login: laura

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:16:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 467
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:41:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
45% of total lot depth.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Maryann Cheung

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 468
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:43:48 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45% of total lot depth.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 469
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:45:54 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 470
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:48:05 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Only up to 45% prefer
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates please. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Esther Tse

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 471
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:50:33 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Jeslynn Ng My email is: jeslynnng@live.com

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 472
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 22, 2017 11:52:38 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Vivien Chun

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 473

Login: Harold S

Responded Feb 22, 2017 16:09:27 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 474

Login: dawn

Responded Feb 22, 2017 17:02:20 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 475

Login: Scrubbers

Responded Feb 22, 2017 20:46:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

We suggest, if there were NO trees on site prior to development, then 2 trees is a MINIMUM. However, if there were PRE-existing trees on the site, then if all or some trees cannot be retained or relocated, then there should be consideration for compensating these losses from the overall municipal tree canopy (in conjunction with the principles of urban forest canopy planning, sustainability and enhancement). In the latter case a minimum of 2 trees should still be required; however, an addition levy would help sustain/retain urban canopy targets by facilitating planting of trees elsewhere in public spaces (e.g. streets, parks).

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

Consider consider a requirement for permeable paving in response to stormwater management best practices where appropriate.

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

not answered

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

Insist on maximum 2 car garages.

| | |
|--|--|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | not answered |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| <p>1- There should be a fee for all tree removal permits. This would facilitate investment in such things as staff, resources and processes committed to urban forest management. 2-Richmond desperately needs an urban forest management plan which provide strategic principles for residential and other development with respect to tree preservation and replacment. Current tree resources will become increasing under threat due to the pressures of climate change (e.g. birch borer infestations now threatens local indigenous Birch trees and has already severely impacted Birch populations in Richmond Nature Park for example). 3-There are significant increases in the number of dead trees in Richmond as a result of warmer, dryer summers. These pose a fire hazard and as such residents should be encouraged to remove these expeditiously. We suggest, a tree removal permit and replacement requirement should still be applicable in this case also; however the permit fee could be waived as an encouragement under these circumstances.</p> | |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News LetsTalkRichmond.ca website |



Respondent No: 476

Login: Kanga7

Responded Feb 22, 2017 20:55:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 477

Login: residentofRmd

Responded Feb 23, 2017 00:52:54 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 478

Responded Feb 23, 2017 10:40:29 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 479

Login: Lorraine

Responded Feb 23, 2017 10:50:47 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
More esthetically pleasing and privacy conscious for neighbours.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | More privacy conscious for neighbours. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Help to eliminate traffic and safety concerns. Reduces visual impact of exclusivity for neighbours. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 480

Login: Reanu

Responded Feb 23, 2017 11:12:37 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 481

Login: Nina

Responded Feb 23, 2017 12:16:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I agree that maybe a change is needed but I don't think imposing a uniform style plan for the entire city is the way to go. What works for 1 family may not work for another. We live in a diverse community, everyone has different needs. Maybe think about this a little more and come up with options.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 482

Login: Harpreet D

Responded Feb 23, 2017 12:29:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 483

Login: Aman.A

Responded Feb 23, 2017 12:34:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 484

Login: Karn235

Responded Feb 23, 2017 13:56:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 485

Login: PSD Richmond resident

Responded Feb 23, 2017 13:59:14 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

There is nothing wrong with the current setbacks. Homes have been built with these setback for years and it seems like majority of the residence DO NOT have any issues with them.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Rear yards are sufficient, and there is no need to change.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: We have already a very generous greenspace requirement, and does not require further changes. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Tree replantation requirement would only enhance the look of the property, and add to the beauty of Richmond.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

This would only add to more cars parked on city streets,

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

The current look works and by setting gates back 6m would look to confined and less parking in your own driveway and add to more vehicles on the street.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

The 3 car garage works and no need to reduce," If it ain't broke, why fix it", this would be the largest mistake made if the city changed the garage projection. This 3 car L shape is one of the best features.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

Q40.Comments:

The building height has been adequate and it is such a shame that the city has refused 3 storey homes, especially for those properties that have water views!

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The city staff has already made such changes recently a bit over a year ago. If Westwind residents are still not happy, perhaps they city should implement a separate regulation for that particular area, and they can add the Steveston area to a similar or separate zoning, or have design panel approve building permits. Most of the Broadmoor area is already built up, and it would be a shame if this new zoning were implemented. It seems that people are fond of these homes, and that is why Richmond has become a world class city! Let's eliminate this word "MASSING" in our beautiful City Of Richmond and think well into the future, and bring this community together!

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 486

Login: shalen

Responded Feb 23, 2017 14:19:47 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I feel that if I own a property in Richmond, I should be allowed to build with the current bylaws and build a home that suits me.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The current set backs are fine as we already have enough back yard space.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

I feel that the city is listing too many restrictions on a property that I own.

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am very disappointed with the City of Richmond for making changes to the current bylaws. We should be able to build a home on a property that we own with current bylaws not new bylaws that seem to be supportive if a few of the small communities. It will look odd new homes alot smaller that the current new ones. I want to be able to design my house. Whats next, is the City going to start dictating what we do inside our homes too.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 487

Login: Barinder

Responded Feb 23, 2017 15:36:32 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I have no idea what would be accomplished by setting entry gates back 20 feet from the property line. That is another way of simply eliminating gates which serves no useful purpose. Entry gates look nice and serve a purpose of crime deterrence. I am absolutely against such a proposal. There should be no restrictions on entry gates. For centuries homeowners have fenced and gated their homes and they were no less part of the community. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I think the first round of building envelope/massing proposals that were put in place last year were sufficient and now these new proposals go beyond what is necessary. Community is lost with empty homes. Community is not grown by taking away the rights of homeowners to build the homes they wish to live in. Keep in mind that WE CANNOT BUILD INTO THE GROUND. Therefore, more land is required to build a home on two stories above ground.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 488

Login: Coolcat

Responded Feb 23, 2017 19:31:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 489

Login: DCL

Responded Feb 23, 2017 19:38:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: thats dumb | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: thats stupid | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43. Please specify:

business owner

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 490

Login: Gurdeep

Responded Feb 23, 2017 19:51:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 491

Login: Rs14

Responded Feb 23, 2017 20:40:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 492

Login: lheartrichmond

Responded Feb 23, 2017 22:53:18 pm

At:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | Yes |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | There should not be restrictions on WHERE the trees are located. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 493

Login: jvirk

Responded Feb 23, 2017 23:38:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 494

Login: newbie2

Responded Feb 24, 2017 07:32:40 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 495

Login: Cmurr

Responded Feb 24, 2017 09:48:37 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
Twitter



Respondent No: 496

Login: Gopi

Responded Feb 24, 2017 10:21:43 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Other

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 497

Login: Jsmann

Responded Feb 24, 2017 14:29:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The existing by-laws are serving us well.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 498

Login: Aderon

Responded Feb 24, 2017 20:43:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Favour option 2 |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Favour option 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Favour option 3 | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 499

Login: Sandra

Responded Feb 24, 2017 21:21:01 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Option 2 |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 500

Login: brunov

Responded Feb 24, 2017 21:29:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 501

Login: apache

Responded Feb 24, 2017 21:51:41 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

There is a 50 meter limit to the rear of the house on ALR land already. The question makes it sound like there isn't a limit at all. This was presented as an ALR issue which led to the amendments.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The reason for the proposed amendments was presented as an issue with very large mega homes on farm land, but this survey was not about ALR land at all! I hope to see no changes to the Richmond building bylaws. I can say with confidence as a builder and home owner for over 30 years in Richmond that the current building bylaws is what attracted many to move to Richmond in the first place from neighbouring municipalities. Large farm homes are already restricted severely to a half acre farm plate and a 50 meter street distance to the rear of the house. Large families rely on big homes to house their members which are required for operating a farm. Limiting the size of houses on ALR land would be an assault on the farming lifestyle of some of Richmond's oldest residents.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 502

Login: Sahota

Responded Feb 25, 2017 09:01:19 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 503

Login: 6260gcr

Responded Feb 25, 2017 17:31:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

In order for this to be successful, the city needs to provide homeowners AND developers with a suggested tree list, specifically arranged by final height and width of tree. Too often homeowners and developers select an inappropriate tree species for the location. While the tree may look full and lovely at the initial planing, it grows too big or too wide, which leads often to improper pruning, which leads to issues with tree, which leads to be tree being removed - all which could have been avoided at the outset if an appropriate tree was selected. You need only look at some of the recent developments where evergreen magnolias or fir trees have been planted as 'front yard' trees.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--|
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: | not answered |
| Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| While we can't regulate taste or specific design, the City can provide direction (which should have been done long ago). Hopefully council will carefully consider these changes and understand that we all want to see more liveable and 'neighbourly' neighbourhoods. Thanks | |
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News |



Respondent No: 504

Login: GM

Responded Feb 25, 2017 17:34:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
Other

Q43. Please specify:

Richmond business owner

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 505

Login: Ruhi

Responded Feb 25, 2017 20:55:48 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I agree we need privacy and bigger and greener yards but we also need the indoor space necessary for the families of today. Because of the weather we spend 9 months a year inside and we need to have enough built area that kids and parents and grandparents or nannies can each have their privacy

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 506

Login: melanie

Responded Feb 27, 2017 08:18:03 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE limit the gross size of square footage now being allowed for single family dwellings. DO NOT allow single family dwellings to be rented as hotel rooms, DO NOT let farm land be destroyed by anyone and DO NOT reduce farm land by any means.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 507

Responded Feb 27, 2017 08:26:01 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The only way I believe to reach a long term solution is by conducting a plebiscite neighbourhood by neighborhood. This allows the residents of the neighbourhood to have final say in what happens in their neighbourhood. I firmly believe this is the democratic way to reach a conclusion on this matter.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 508
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:11:28 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 509
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:13:47 am
At:



- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 510
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:15:38 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 511
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:17:24 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 512
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:21:45 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 513
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:22:56 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family

Building Massing updates as I am:

(check all that apply)

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 514
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:26:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

VERY STRONGLY NO, NO, NO My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 515
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:28:36 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

PLEASE DON'T CHANGE ANYTHING My name is:

My e-mail is:

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 516
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:29:55 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 517
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:32:23 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 518
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:33:36 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 519
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:34:47 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 520
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:36:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 521
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:39:09 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: My e-mail address is:

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 522
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:42:16 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 523
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:43:25 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 524
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:44:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
NO
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 525
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:45:48 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 526
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:47:32 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 527
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:49:09 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 528
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:51:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please retain current status quo. The new houses look good and the City of Richmond attracts new immigrants and most people love the bigger homes with 3 car garages. My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 529
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:56:28 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 530
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:57:23 am

At:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 531
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:58:19 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 532
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Feb 27, 2017 10:59:11 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 533

Responded Feb 27, 2017 13:49:31 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 534

Login: Rujun

Responded Feb 27, 2017 17:23:31 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Twitter



Respondent No: 535

Login: Ajit

Responded Feb 27, 2017 19:06:10 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

This will not help reduce the massing in any way.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

Reducing the rear setback will impact the FAR and affect the internal ceiling heights.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

positioning the setbacks more to the side of the back yard will reduce landscaping opportunities.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: this is already happening on single family homes. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I would like the city to provide a traffic study for the inside streets and tell me how this change will improve vehicle safety. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: This issue will not reduce massing and will restrict the flexibility of good house design. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 536

Login: Bec

Responded Feb 27, 2017 19:24:16 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 537

Login: canadannorm

Responded Feb 28, 2017 00:44:57 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 538

Login: zero

Responded Feb 28, 2017 03:34:26 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
I am more concerned about the height than the rear or side yard setback.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Why the detail of option 1 is not displayed on the board? |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: I support an amendment with a minimum of anywhere from 25% to 45% of the required front yard setback must be landscaped with live plantings. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: It is not uncommon to have 3 or more occupants in a single family house, option 3 or 4 will likely put more cars to the street which causes safety and security concerns. I think option 2 is not necessary because a lot of the houses built now, with no restrictions, mostly have either 2 or 3-car garage | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 539

Login: Joanne T

Responded Feb 28, 2017 09:58:49 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** not answered
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I don't like the idea of gates at all...it is very unwelcoming...so if gates must be there...make them minimal. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 540

Login: vigi

Responded Feb 28, 2017 12:21:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 541

Login: Michael1976

Responded Feb 28, 2017 13:31:49 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

There are still many neighbourhoods with mostly older homes and newer homes should best conform to fit into the excising neighbourhoods, neighbourhoods that were in many cases initially built with a plan for the entire street.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The problems with new houses right now in regards to backyards are they 1) enclose the yards of houses on either side, making their yard into more of a court yard, limiting sunshine and 2) house are pushed further back in the front to house on either side, often because of 3-car garages, pushing the house back further than it needs to be.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

This is very important - Houses built to best coexist with existing neighbours.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Light for neighbours shouldn't be needlessly affected. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Too many new lots have less green space than existing homes. Not as nice aesthetically or environmentally. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

**Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.Comments:

Also, too many perfectly good trees are being cut down for new lost. Unless the tree is sick, it should be protected and higher consequences to developers for illegally cutting them down. Perhaps a reduction in sq for each illegally cut tree would dissuade them from doing so more than a fine they consider a cost of business.

**Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

Yes

**Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

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

**Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.Comments:

More landscaping and less concrete.

**Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

Gates in neighbourhood are not welcoming and take the "neighbor" out of neighbourhood. While not an issue on main roads, in subdivision, I would support banning gates going forward and having all gates in subdivisions removed within a specific time frame (5-10 years?)

**Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

Yes

**Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

These 3 or 4 car garages that project out are unsightly, reduce landscaping and don't match existing homes. Considering we're pushing transit use, should we be encouraging 3 or 4 car garages? Extra cars can park on driveways or on the street like many of us have done for years. There is also abuse - using garage as a room or for storage and parking their cars outside regardless.

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height not answered

Q40.Comments:

This needs to be more consistent with other cities and reduce loss of sunshine for neighbours.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I strongly feel its time to put homeowners - people living in their homes, many for decades - interests against that of developers who will do business in the city regardless of regulations and who don't have the well being of Richmond homeowners as a priority.

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify: not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 542

Login: brian

Responded Feb 28, 2017 14:44:42 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Too many of the newer houses occupy a very high percentage of the lot size.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| | Many of the newer houses are too close to each other but for smaller lots it might not be practical to eliminate all side yard projections. |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| | The decks on some of the newer houses appear to have unrestricted views over neighbours property. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| | A lot of the newer homes appear to pave over the entire lot and both from a visual and health aspect a larger areas of green space or shrubbery are desirable. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

It appears that builders and/or developers take trees out at their discretion and are happy to pay the resulting fines. This practice must be stopped and/or the fines increased to an amount commensurate with enforcement.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

See previous comment regarding a healthy environment.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
|--|------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I would support a restriction on limiting the height of fencing and gates in general to a maximum of 5 feet. r

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

This would result in a (no pun intended) level playing field.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Too many houses are being built with the ground floor slab higher than the adjacent neighbouring properties ,often resulting in subsidence or water run-off onto the neighbours lot. The result is that not only does it reduce the potential value of the neighbours house but it also looks like the permit issuers and inspectors were looking the other way when the plans were approved.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 543

Login: DeeofRichmond

Responded Feb 28, 2017 16:11:15 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The loss of landscaping due to LACK of setback regulation has not only created fire hazards, but destroyed neighborhoods that once were lush and green. Gone are thousands of legacy fruit trees, flower beds, green space - all replaced by concrete driveways, gates and walls.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

When a city is nothing but building, concrete and asphalt, then heat gain increases dramatically. Richmond is becoming a concrete jungle, and for a province that calls itself Green, Richmond is falling way behind. Beijing comes to mind, where nothing green/living exists - only concrete, glass and asphalt.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: The problem with current status quo, is that roof eaves are so close that a person can step from one roof to another. I see a fire hazard, a loss of privacy and irresponsible construction. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Status quo so long as the setback changes are instituted. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| Or, if existing trees exist, are healthy and do not restrict the building envelope, they must be maintained. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height**

not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 544

Responded Feb 28, 2017 17:46:21 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 545

Login: janetderasp

Responded Feb 28, 2017 19:51:45 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 546

Login: Rishell

Responded Mar 01, 2017 01:46:44 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 547

Login: bobw

Responded Mar 01, 2017 03:36:11 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond City planning staff and supportive members of City Council are to be commended for recognizing the need to act now, please, to control the too-often-rampant excesses of unregulated, or inadequately regulated, massing effects evident in single-family housing in our city. Some very significant changes to the Richmond zoning bylaw have been proposed to end the excesses. Listening to residents has been an important step. Learning from the experiences of other communities can be instructive. Now comes the big test. Informed, insightful leadership at the city level is required to approve and implement considered initiatives that genuinely can contribute meaningfully to maintaining the viability and liveability of our city's single-family neighbourhoods while accommodating and effectively managing the realities - and potential benefits - of responsibly planned growth and appropriate change.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 548

Login: MD

Responded Mar 01, 2017 11:13:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
The current regulations are good.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
The current regulations are good.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: The racoons just dig everything up and make a mess...! | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The combination of reduced building sizes, limitation of garage sizes, and adding in gate setbacks seems very extreme. I don't support any of these types of changes.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 549

Login: blueberryben

Responded Mar 01, 2017 11:32:02 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

House size restrictions should be left unchanged. In a time where land values are soaring larger homes are more efficient for larger families that have room to grow in to the house without having to relocate to another area or municipality. reducing or increasing restrictions in my opinion is, "going back in time." We are a democratic progressive society and lets keep it that way. Residents live here because of all this City has to offer and is spacious compared to our neighbours to the north and lets keep it that way.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I don't see how this helps anyone other than restricting sqft from the home, which takes away from the home owners options when they are building a new home. This seems very unnecessary to me.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

This is unnecessary is support status quo as the home owner should be able to build an accessory building that is the best possible lay out for their home. I am not in favour of any change because this takes away from the home owner who has invested a lot of money in the City by developing the home and should not be penalized for doing so. Richmond has benefited from a lot of investment over the years more so than other communities surrounding us do not forget about that. Their is no problem in my opinion, if anything Richnmondites should welcome the investment with open arms as it has done wonders for the City. As the saying goes, "don't bite the hand that feeds you."

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

Again I say no change...all the houses will look like boxes if side yard set back is brought it. It will make for architectural eye sores.

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q19.Comments

Should not be changed as this limits the design and options for the property owner. Let me state one thing here...homes have approximate 40-50 life anyone complaining about imposing decks probably live in an old home that is nearing the end of its life span and will probably be rebuilt upon in the near future and be more like the home built next to it years prior. Don't hold progress back by limiting options for the home owner, the financial burden and feat to build a new home should be a welcome sign of progress in our community and it is clearly what the citizens want and shouldn't be punished by these proposals for change.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping

not answered

Q23.Comments:

I have been living in Richmond for nearly 30 years and let me tell you it is one of the most beautiful Cities in the world. The City does beautiful landscaping along road and in parks, so much so that my friends from other municipalities comment on this. I feel that this is symbiotic with the relationship between the residents and the City itself...one encourages the other meaning that the City does a good job of landscaping and so do the residents. If you drive around the City you will see if you haven't already magnificent yards in much of Richmond. In conclusion, I do think this is a non issue as landscaping is happening all over the place in Richmond.

Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot.

Yes

Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits

not answered

Q26.Comments:

I think this is great idea. As the tree grows it shades in the summer and insulates in the winter so I am for this amendment as it will create a more energy efficient home and beneficial for everyone.

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below)

not answered

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements

not answered

Q30.Comments:

please refer to my answer above for board 13

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.

No

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

Gate should be at the front of the property line not in the middle of the yard where people can not even use the driveway properly anymore. My answer is a big NO leave it status Quo!

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

This design of home is unique to Richmond as a Vancouver Special is to Vancouver. No I do not support the change and should be left where it is.

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

I feel that it is fine way it is now.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The changes proposed in this survey can have significant changes to the City. Lets not forget all the major investment made in our communities by the new money that has flowed in. Change is good and Richmond is beautiful and increasingly so day by day. To stop progress is regress and we are not a regressive community. Lets move forward with status quo and get out and enjoy our City. Live and let live.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|---|---------------|



Respondent No: 550

Login: llovesteveston

Responded Mar 01, 2017 11:42:30 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 551

Login: Sandradolphin

Responded Mar 01, 2017 11:46:02 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 552

Login: deep

Responded Mar 01, 2017 12:06:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 553

Login: Terraone

Responded Mar 01, 2017 13:40:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| (1) Access in case of fire is vital, although I wonder if firefighters would endanger themselves by going through a tight side yard. (2) It should be possible to move a wheelbarrow from front to back yard so that garden materials don't have to go through the house. (3) Side yards should be wide enough that a homeowner can put up a ladder to his second floor. I have heard that some have to put up the ladder in the neighbour's yard. That is clearly a sign of a bad bylaw. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Privacy is a prime consideration. It's bad enough that we are seeing giant windows overlooking back yards. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Neighbourhoods are losing too many trees because lots are clearcut before building. We are seeing healthy trees cut down when they should have been retained. An excellent example of this is at 6660 Mayflower Drive where a good-sized star magnolia, next to the fence on a 10 foot sewer allowance, was cut down even though it would not have impacted the new house. Take a look at the site drawings: you can see where it was. Builders are throwing away dollar value when they cut down trees. I don't know which department should do this, but make efforts to inform new immigrants AND builders that trees contribute to a healthy environment by giving off oxygen and absorbing carbon. Trees also have value for the environment as bird habitat (birds increase pollination and remove insects), and increased property curbside appeal.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

This is a brilliant suggestion. People who are too lazy to open their gates park on the sidewalk instead, forcing pedestrians onto the street. There are examples of these set-back gates on Granville between No. 1 Road and McCallan. They provide room for off-street parking when the gate is closed - very useful for visitors.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Simplicity is good. This should also eliminate houses that are situated on their own private berms.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

These concerns are not included in this bylaw but are important to neighbourhoods. (1) New houses commonly have many, many outside lights all around the property. I have counted as many as 4 dozen lights on the front of a house. These are not necessary, contribute to light pollution, and intrude on neighbouring properties, even shining in windows. They do not protect a house, but rather enable an intruder. A better protection is a light that is triggered by movement. (2) New front barricades (fence is too polite a word for these) also have bright lights on every support pillar. Some of these lights are brighter than the street lights. Again, light pollution and intrusive lighting. Our street lights are sufficient. (3) The tendency to build concrete/stone front barricades gives the impression that Richmond is a dangerous place to live. Back in the 1980s/1990s the city council of the day decided that it did not want gated communities, but today, every lot is now its own gated community (credit for this concept goes to my neighbour). This city is allowing builders to create an unfriendly environment that gives the impression that Richmond is crime-ridden: either outside or inside the gates, it's not clear where, but it adds to our growing lack of neighbourliness and trust.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca LetsTalkRichmond.ca website Word of mouth |
|---|---|



Respondent No: 554

Login: rockymangat

Responded Mar 01, 2017 14:01:07 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 555

Responded Mar 01, 2017 14:35:15 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 556

Login: DC1234

Responded Mar 01, 2017 15:52:01 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 557

Login: Rupl

Responded Mar 01, 2017 15:52:20 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 558

Login: Peter

Responded Mar 01, 2017 17:19:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 559

Login: ChrisL

Responded Mar 01, 2017 19:48:56 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 560

Login: dramsum

Responded Mar 01, 2017 19:51:44 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 561

Login: Ella

Responded Mar 01, 2017 20:13:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | Entire gardens should't be removed in the first place. Tragic waste. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | HOW IS THIS NOT ALREADY MANDATORY? All of these homes taken down are killing all of the beautiful trees and vegetation, ultimately causing more waste and pollution as trees clean the air. It's atrocious that trees aren't left alone and that they can just pave the whole damn lot with nothing. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Cement is ugly and is bad for the water table and the environment. This should have been done years ago. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

New, ugly monster homes stick out and look terrible in neighborhoods. However, I guess it doesn't matter as it's just a matter of time before everything is torn down and rebuilt removing any sort of character or uniqueness from the city of Richmond. We're already half way there... just keep issuing the demolition permits and erasing history/creating needless waste/pricing people out of the market (too late on that)/destroying vegetation/encouraging demo-flipping etc etc etc. I'm so disgusted at what I've seen since I moved here and no one at city hall is doing anything. I guess they're getting paid too.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 562

Login: Evolution

Responded Mar 01, 2017 21:20:20 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Nowadays there are more people moving to Richmond , we are living in 2017 not 1900 , we all pay taxes , having a house at its max is more useful than just a back yard of lawn that owners don't really go out to the back until either cutting lawn or BBQ at the in the summer time , useage at the back yard are so minimal . City of Richmond needs to put that as an option allowing new house owner to have a choice of max allowable ,

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

A backyard with larger green yard is actually quite useless , more cutting and what cutting the lawn ? A lawnmower that produce more emission than cars , and we are taking about green ? Really ? Nowadays , people spend more time working to pay taxes and living expenses , don't u think that a larger house with able to rent to another family can support the city running operation ?

Q10.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q16.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
|--|------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q19.Comments

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q23.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| This should be an option for owners choice | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| I don't live on grass or in a tree , as long as there are some sort of green and tidy , that would be enough , I think the city can work with the new house builder to layout the options , as long as making the new dwelling beautiful | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| <hr/> | |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| More space for kids to play , and more cars park after the gate prevent vandalism . | |
| <hr/> | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| <hr/> | |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| <hr/> | |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| The city should consider on higher tax on no limit garage projection | |
| <hr/> | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** No (retain status quo)

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story



Respondent No: 563

Login: Richmondgirl

Responded Mar 01, 2017 21:46:18 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Yes we need to make new houses compatible with existing neighbourhoods, so there can be balance again. We have no balance now.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Need one shrub and one tree in the back yard.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Fire safety of Canada recommends houses should be at least 10 feet apart and new houses in Richmond do not meet these standards. We need to eliminate projections that make houses close together. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments If there was more of a yard we shouldn't need a deck on a second floor at all. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Richmond really needs to make new houses smaller. With more greenspace we will have healthier neighbourhoods. Right now Richmond has the smallest setbacks of nearby municipalities and that needs to be changed. There would be more privacy, more sunlight also. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| We still need to prioritize retention over planting. These 2 Trees should not include dwarf varieties and should be of a certain height for a medium sized tree. Also varieties should be included that are native to BC and palm trees/non native trees should not be included in the 2 tree requirement. We need to protect songbird habitat and they need native trees for their survival. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| Yes so many new houses have no greenspace, no trees, no shrubs in the front yard. I would also like to see a requirement to have 2 medium sized flowering shrubs planted per lot for our declining bee population. Pollinating shrubs are quickly disappearing in our neighbourhoods. We have gardens and farmland that relies on bees. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Both the gate and fence should be banned, they are unwelcoming structures. They should not be in single family neighbourhoods. Both should be 20 feet from the front property line to discourage them altogether. Many trees die when the fences are built close to their roots. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: | |
| Richmond needs to get back to a sensible sized garage. There is also street and driveway parking also if needed. These huge garages are taking away greenspace and trees. | |
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | |
| Large new homes have been ruining our Richmond neighbourhoods for years. Please preserve what is left of them, as many are almost gone and only consist of concrete, bricks, gates. Street appeal is gone, as well as our trees, birds and bees. Houses 10-15 years were not as massive as they are now, and how did it all change and get out of control? You need to match other municipalities for their setbacks. | |
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |



Respondent No: 564

Login: FunGuyGee

Responded Mar 02, 2017 06:09:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 565

Login: blueray333

Responded Mar 02, 2017 07:17:03 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 566

Login: J

Responded Mar 02, 2017 07:54:34 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 567

Login: FamilyChoy

Responded Mar 02, 2017 08:04:07 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

We live in a well established family oriented cul-de sac. Our homes have yards and green space for children to play around without gates and obtrusive fences that divide neighbors. We welcome you to visit Mirabel Court during the summer to see the children play, laugh and the community it creates.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Let's not have people's homes tower over older homes who have beautiful backyards and gardens. Monster homes don't create community. Monster homes create walls and barriers to a good community. Shrubs, cedars and other landscaping are planted to provide privacy as those homes are "towering" over neighbors. This is not creating community - it is wall building !! (if you know what i mean).

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 568

Login: Julia

Responded Mar 02, 2017 08:42:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 569

Login: mrtini

Responded Mar 02, 2017 09:09:08 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

This would depend on the surrounding houses. The larger the lot then go with 55%.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

6m is not enough when it comes to privacy.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Do not allow accessory buildings larger than 10m²

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| This just a way for developers to squeeze in more square footage. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Again this will improve privacy | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| The value of the property increases when more area is allowed for landscaping. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| At this years home show a speaker who is an expert in outdoor space design stated that a mature tree is worth \$20000 added value to the property. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Will help to reduce the fortress look of the neighbourhood. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Right now with the proliferation of 3 car garages puts a lie to Richmond's policy of trying to reduce greenhouse gases. Also Richmond has one of the largest car ownership statistic in BC. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Will remove uncertainty from building approval and prevent cheating by developers. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Many great options though I do not think that option 3 will approved to due the fact that most council members is beholden to the developers. I hope I am wrong. I live in Seafair and have now lost all privacy to due the short sighted vision of Richmond councillors, past and present. It is like living in a fish bowl. I have heard that there is a lot of angst from developers about these proposed bylaw changes so I believe not much will be done.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|--|-----------------|



Respondent No: 570

Login: Mandy

Responded Mar 02, 2017 09:36:01 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please put a stop to the building of megahomes that are depleting Richmond of its tree canopy cover. In comparison to neighbouring municipalities, Richmond has the smallest front, side and rear setbacks. My husband and I bought our home on Gamba Drive 10 years ago. We fell in love with the area as the neighbourhood had many majestic, significant trees and beautiful homes that left plenty of room on their lots to allow for hedges and greenery to flourish. Today, many of the beautiful, tall, mature trees as well as significant hedges have been killed and removed to make way for megahome after megahome. Richmond is seeing a decline in enrollment in our public schools. The homes in our neighbourhoods have become completely unaffordable to the average working family. The construction of these megahomes certainly does not encourage families to move into our neighbourhoods. The homes are simply unaffordable. Building setbacks should allow for existing, significant, mature trees, shrubs and hedges to remain unharmed. Homes on lots should not overtake the property. - Mark trunk with paint - "safe limb" line. - Increasing fines for builders - Large deposit to City to ensure tree protection. Builder gets it back at the end of building. Some samples of the negative effects of the building of megahomes in my immediate neighbourhood include the following: - Killing of approximately 7 or 8 City protected very large, mature white pine trees across the street from us. - Removal of stunning ornamental cherry tree right beside of us, plus many other mature shrubs - Removal of huge hedge across from neighbour on Gamba Drive - corner house - new build - Removal of huge hedge at the old white house to make way for the monstrosity - Would like City to plant large, native trees on boulevard of new corner build across from Barb - Large shrubs should be protected too. Provides safe haven, nesting areas for wild birds and refuge for urban wildlife - How our neighbourhood was lined with mature trees when we moved in 10 years ago - how the massive builds have eradicated much of the green canopy. Thank you for your consideration. I truly hope the City will make amendments to protect what is left of Richmond's dwindling tree canopy, live plantings on residential properties and limitations on house footprint - including height restrictions.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 571

Login: Ynotony

Responded Mar 02, 2017 10:46:35 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

I commend the City's planning staff and its supportive members for recognizing the need to act now and hopefully control as soon as possible the blatant actions taken by single-family homeowners to build excessive and humongous homes. These homes not only destroy the overall character of the neighbourhood but it also generates hatred among neighbours. I urge the City to listen to their long-term residents, learn from other municipalities and implement initiatives that will ensure a vibrant, peaceful and liveable City of Richmond.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)****Q43.Please specify:**

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 572

Login: Gary S.

Responded Mar 02, 2017 11:23:22 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Option 1.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 573

Login: Dave

Responded Mar 02, 2017 12:07:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 574

Login: KH

Responded Mar 02, 2017 12:59:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 575

Login: westerly

Responded Mar 02, 2017 14:24:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 576

Login: chand3

Responded Mar 02, 2017 14:32:12 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 577

Login: Emporio Group

Responded Mar 02, 2017 14:47:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Its home owners property they should be allowed to build there dream homes as they wish.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 578

Login: vigie

Responded Mar 02, 2017 14:49:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 579

Login: BG

Responded Mar 02, 2017 14:58:53 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond is a beautiful place. There has been new construction happening of many years. Why does the City of some of its residents at this point feel a change needs to happen. Having the freedom to build a so called Mega home in Richmond is one of the reason i chose to live here. Having a combination of large and small homes is what makes Richmond unique from the other cities and a beautiful place to live.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 580

Login: moe

Responded Mar 02, 2017 15:07:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 581

Login: sanjkkk

Responded Mar 02, 2017 15:13:31 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 582

Login: SPM

Responded Mar 02, 2017 15:23:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 583

Login: Polly

Responded Mar 02, 2017 16:38:17 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 584

Login: IF

Responded Mar 02, 2017 16:44:06 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 585

Login: Change

Responded Mar 02, 2017 16:50:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 586

Login: gopher

Responded Mar 02, 2017 16:53:30 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I think it is important to begin lowering peoples expectations for housing in Richmond. This may encourage more affordable single family houses and reduce the need for ever increasing densification.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

I hope the same considerations are implemented for residents such as myself. Our property backs onto 2 Road properties and as such we are facing the possibility of future townhouse development looming over our backyard.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Some people are just not meant to be gardeners! I for one have had many untimely "deaths" in my green family. Apart from that, trees need to be kept at a safe height which would seem to add an enforcement burden on the city.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Promotes a feeling of "neighbourhood" in addition some of the current choices of property owners would seem to present safety concerns

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

As in my answer to the first question-we need to begin reducing expectations.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Continuing to allow the proliferation of multi million dollar houses increases the need to densify in order to provide affordable housing for the majority. This is not only unsustainable it is unfair to our children and grandchildren. We need to think about what the future looks like while we still have a choice.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 587

Login: WendyK

Responded Mar 02, 2017 17:52:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | I think this is the key issue: the total site coverage needs to be decreased. Right now, the city is turning into a village of cookie-cutter McMansions that are completely out of scale for the lot sizes. The houses themselves look foolish, but also change the physical character of their neighbourhoods, and really impinge on the formation of a neighbourhood community. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

This is necessary to promote a community feeling. But. It will be completely useless if the sites aren't monitored post-construction. I know of several homes in my neighbourhood that at one time had lawns (albeit tiny ones) in the front yard, which have now been bricked over to provide additional parking. I wouldn't mind if the owners had put a rock garden or something like that - but right now, it seems that having parking lots outside the front entrance is preferable.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Actually. I would prefer to completely ban these, but I understand that isn't possible. In homes that maximize their lot coverage (under the existing regulations), these gates and fences look silly. There isn't breathing space between the road/sidewalk and the gate, nor is there sufficient visual space between the house and gate.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Really, the key issue here is that the bylaws for house size allow finished houses that are too large for their lots, and now (as opposed to previously), consumers are actually building/buying to the maximum size allowed. That said, I have one concern about the proposed regulations: that they will mean that builders end up constructing even more cookie-cutter homes, that have limited architectural interest, beyond being the biggest house allowed. I desperately would like to see Richmond return to having neighbourhoods that are liveable communities, where there is space for children to play in their front/back yards, and individual homes didn't dwarf one another. I would like to see a community where homes weren't seen as a symbol of wealth, with individuals trying to outdo one another with size, outside finishings, and inappropriate tree plantings. Rather, I would like to see more modest homes, where the surrounding property is cared for, and where people actually live.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 588

Login: Lsgill

Responded Mar 02, 2017 17:56:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 589

Responded Mar 02, 2017 18:21:54 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I think the current by-law is enough. To regulate the maximum depth of house will hurt the housing price. It only make the houses with the old limit can be sold for the higher price but the owner under the new rules cannot. They new proposal makes the city provide the unfair situation to the homeowners. It divide the community and create more conflict.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The new proposal only create the conflict in our community. Unless the city allow the new owner can build the same floor space (under the current by-law) by allowing more height of the building.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

It only create the conflict to the community (why the new owner can build a smaller house)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Do not create any conflict to the community | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Do not create ant conflict to the community | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Do not create any conflict to the community | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Do not create any conflict to the community

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

Do not create any conflict to the community

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Do not create conflict to the community.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Do not create any conflict to the community. It will hurt the hosing price. It is not fair to the current home owner.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

I support if the home owner can build the house with higher height.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The proposal will hurt the housing price. It is not good to the community. It divide the people into 2 groups and create more conflict in our community.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 590

Login: craig

Responded Mar 02, 2017 19:22:51 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

I cannot support any of the 3 options because all three allow for a massive structure on large properties especially, ALR properties. For example, a 5 acre property with 120' of frontage and a depth of approx. 1800 feet. Your most conservative Option 3 would allow a house to have a depth up to 800 feet. Unless I am calculating this incorrectly, that amount of depth is MASSIVE. Please review and if I'm correct, go back to the drawing table and put a limit under 150 feet.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** not answered

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
|--|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 591

Login: GROCKD

Responded Mar 02, 2017 19:27:02 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 592

Login: ehanson

Responded Mar 02, 2017 19:43:19 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I think that City Council has allowed developers to turn our charming city into a hideous place with oversized homes that destroy any lawn and save the odd tree on the extremity of the property. Front yards are paved so people can have a parking lot. Walls and gates scream out, "We don't feel safe in this city and we don't want to integrate. We want to segregate" In an era where inclusion is bandied about, exclusion is what happens in Richmond with the monstrosities that pose for houses. They are out of size and dwarf older houses and often put them in shade. Richmond is the Wild West, anything goes (almost) and greed, not real planning is the top priority. I've lived here all my 66 years and I am disgusted with what our city council (most are incumbents who want unsustained growth at any cost. As a biology teacher, unrestrained growth in organisms is called cancer, and eventually kills the organism. Is there a lesson here for the major and the majority of councillors???

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

| | |
|--|--|
| Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12.Comments: | not answered |
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: not answered | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Yes

Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height

not answered

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 593

Login: Fishman

Responded Mar 02, 2017 20:34:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 594

Login: yvette

Responded Mar 02, 2017 21:02:28 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

These huge mega houses built nowadays are like ghost houses with hardly anybody living in them except the caretaker taking care of the house and the property around. Most of the time they are in darkness. It is high time the City of Richmond proposes the vacant house tax like the City of Vancouver

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 595

Login: Km

Responded Mar 02, 2017 21:33:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 596

Login: HH

Responded Mar 02, 2017 21:50:39 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I do not see the need for a further change to existing zoning bylaw. The change will only increase the disparity between houses in a neighbourhood. Most 40+ old houses are built for a different era to meet the needs for that time, which is not the same for current time.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: The current zoning bylaw is fine | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments The current zoning bylaw is fine | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: The current zoning bylaw is fine | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

The current zoning bylaw is fine

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The current zoning bylaw is fine, and I feel it balances the needs of residents and developers.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 597

Login: Eggplant

Responded Mar 03, 2017 07:40:41 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

There should also be a regulation that protects existing resident's property value. For example, house depth is limited to 50% of lot depth, or no more than 12 feet beyond the neighbouring house's rear wall, whichever is lesser.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Requiring garages to face the street would dramatically increase the amount of landscaping for a home. Turning a garage requires a huge amount of hardscaping. I'm disappointed this wasn't addressed. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

**Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.Comments:

The tree plantings must be from a list of accepted species. The tree plantings must also be protected by law. I know of many instances of trees planted for requirement and later removed because they weren't big enough to require a permit for removal.

**Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

Yes

**Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

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

**Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.Comments:

Again, it could easily be increased by requiring garages on non-arterial roads to face the street, which would reduce the footprint of the driveway by half.

**Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

Gates should not be allowed in residential areas, unless the home is on an arterial road.

**Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

Yes

**Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

Garages should be required to face the street.

| | |
|---|---|
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: | not answered |
| Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have: | not answered |
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story LetsTalkRichmond.ca website Facebook Word of mouth |



Respondent No: 598

Login: JTrichmond

Responded Mar 03, 2017 08:19:02 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Already have made the restrictions necessary to homes last time!
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Have a right to put a proper gate for safety and security to suit our needs | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 599

Login: marvin

Responded Mar 03, 2017 09:33:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 600

Responded Mar 03, 2017 09:40:18 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: gates provide safety in a community that is seeing increased crime. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 601

Responded Mar 03, 2017 09:46:37 am

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: not answered | |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: not answered | |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: not answered | |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: larger driveways are required as our area has no sidewalks. Where would we park our 4 cars in this case? | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: gates provide an additional measure of safety. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 602

Responded Mar 03, 2017 11:16:59 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 603

Login: zizroop

Responded Mar 03, 2017 13:01:33 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

Other

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 604

Login: daruma

Responded Mar 03, 2017 13:16:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Home sizes are infringing on neighbours and environmentally unsustainable.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 605

Login: RJ

Responded Mar 03, 2017 13:27:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Building at current rate deprives the adjacent properties of sun and views.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I would prefer to have no gates as these tend to destroy the neighborhood | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: The new buildings with a paved over front yard do not contribute to being environment friendly | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: I have found that some of the buildings with steep roofs have added space over the garage which was not allowed at planing but converted after final inspections. The height should be limited so that this additional living space cannot be added. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The side setbacks should be such that the snow sliding off the roof does not fall into the adjacent property as I find happening now.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|--|-----------------|



Respondent No: 606

Login: psykes

Responded Mar 03, 2017 13:59:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 607

Login: Bridie

Responded Mar 03, 2017 14:37:09 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Long walls and great height cut off much of the sunlight from the garden

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I prefer the percentage approach with the minimum of 20 ft for smaller lots

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| Fire hazard when these wooden buildings are built so close to fences and the next building. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Greater privacy for the neighbours | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| This needs to be live plants. I notice that several beds of flowers at the initial selling have now been covered with bricks for additional car parking. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Many trees die from lack of maintenance or water. It would be nice to include fruit trees or flowering trees to increase the bee habitat. Do you have a list of preferred trees to enhance the Richmond environment?

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

When I first moved to Richmond the street vista of lawns was very attractive and one of the reasons I moved here. Vancouver has managed to keep this openness of front gardens. Maybe Richmond should follow thier lead.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I think if a larger front garden is required, this would reduce the incentive to have obstructing from walls. Openess enhances the community spirit.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Richmond has many cookie cutter L shaped buildings that are ugly and repetitive. Lets improve the urban design!

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

The new houses are so big they overlook neighbors for 2 or 3 house lengths. On Riverdale they are currently building huge block houses that maximize sq footage and overwhelm the side residences.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I am for densification rather than encroaching on farm land. I'd prefer that zoning allowed 2 residences on a 60 ft lot, rather than the huge building mass houses that are currently allowed. 2 smaller SF houses instead of a duplex are a family friendly option too. Both approaches would probably allow a less expensive housing within the home owner grant.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 608

Login: zhao feng

Responded Mar 03, 2017 14:54:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 609

Login: pwh

Responded Mar 03, 2017 15:20:07 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 610

Login: HDhinjal

Responded Mar 03, 2017 15:20:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: I should be allowed to build on my property, as we have been allowed to all these years. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: My property , so let me what I want! | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 611

Login: sting

Responded Mar 03, 2017 15:42:17 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I like option 2, to maintain a good proportion between building and green space.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| Options 1 & 2 do not provide adequate space between adjacent houses. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Option 2 is a more pleasing design. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| Option 2 is a good balance. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Option 2, out of the choices, however, I do not see the need for gates at all. They are not neighborly. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Option 3 is preferred. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Staff proposal is reasonable. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

New Richmond single family houses are too big, bulky, boring and look the same. There should be a mixture of design like Vancouver.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 612

Login: window

Responded Mar 03, 2017 16:00:55 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 613

Login: DonnaM

Responded Mar 03, 2017 16:20:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
No one should have their home and lifestyle affected by someone's building
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 614

Login: CKnappett

Responded Mar 03, 2017 17:43:15 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 615

Login: Carolle

Responded Mar 03, 2017 17:59:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 616

Login: Diatom

Responded Mar 03, 2017 18:06:46 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Devil in the details: the aesthetics of building massing are contingent upon the "apparent" lot size (boulevard to back fence), not the actual lot dimensions, which are casually indiscernible to passers-by and neighbors; things get complicated with kite- and pie-shaped lots (from which point is setback measured?).

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Bike sheds, bay windows and chimneys are not the problem. Ain't broke, why fix it. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments I don't see the point of the deck width restriction; typically the purpose of the "deck" in new builds is in fact "barbecue zone cover" with respect to the underlying storey. I find modern decks inoffensive - the issues are elevation, setback & landscaping. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: I don't see why my aversion to paved-over yards should restrict my neighbors' preferences. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| Garages are the most hostile of the offending intrusions & projections under consideration. In certain neighborhoods ("The Duns" for example) they have materially changed the character of the neighborhood and utterly dehumanized and homogenized front facade appearance. Houses are for persons, not cars. | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Yes, current "houses high" practice effectively undermine original intent of the rules promulgated under a "road high" historical standard.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I'm concerned that we're getting carried away. City staff are sufficiently sophisticated to realize (perhaps not without some sympathy) that there is a degree of xenophobic tokenism in the grouching about housing - when culture-shock is silenced, folks will voice exaggerated concerns over symbolic projections of newcomers they haven't yet become accustomed to. If we cave to every such complaint, we're all going to live in de facto strata housing, undermining quiet enjoyment of property. I don't like the idea of spending \$2MM on a 4000SF lot only to have bureaucrats regulate every scintilla of development, use and character.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 617

Responded Mar 03, 2017 18:29:57 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

In view of the changes in weather patterns and world politics Canada needs to be able to feed its own population. So it is important to retain agricultural land for that purpose. Richmond appears to be transforming into a city of monster homes and pretentious palaces, neither of which fit into the west coast landscape.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 618

Login: Keren

Responded Mar 03, 2017 18:41:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Richmond Houses are unique and the New houses look amazing. That is why I am living in Richmond and so do a lot of my friends. There is definitely NO requirement to change the Status quo just to satisfy a handful of residents who have nothing better to do than stir up trouble. Leave them the way they are. Thanks

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 619

Login: Soheil

Responded Mar 03, 2017 19:07:18 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 620

Login: JMc

Responded Mar 03, 2017 19:46:35 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

New houses that occupy more than 50% of lot depth are not welcome in neighbourhoods that have more reasonably sized family homes.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: New houses should NOT have any projections. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Second storey decks on new houses must be designed not to impact the privacy of adjacent homes and associated yards. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Too many new houses have excessive amounts of pavement, gravel and other hard surfaces with little or no live landscaping. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

Q25.**Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.**Comments:**

Established Richmond neighbourhoods are losing too many mature trees due to property redevelopment.

Q27.**I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

Yes

Q28.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

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

Q29.**Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.**Comments:**

Front yards in too many NEW house lots do not have any green landscaping. The focus is, too often, towards on-site car parking and hard surfaces.

Q31.**I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

Yes

Q32.**Board 16 - Entry Gates**

not answered

Q33.**Comments:**

The best solution for new house design is to prohibit entry gates and the oversize walls associated with these gates.

Q34.**I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

Yes

Q35.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.**Board 17 - Garage Projections**

not answered

Q37.**Comments:**

Oversize garages (e.g. garages that accommodate more than 2 cars) are unsightly and should not be permitted.

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Far too many established neighbourhoods are being negatively impacted by massive NEW houses that do not conform with the massing, height and setbacks of adjacent family homes.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I am concerned that the opinions of long-time Richmond homeowners will be drowned out by developers and investors who have no interest in building new houses that conform with the house design and massing of existing family homes.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 621

Login: thomps82

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:03:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 622

Login: BILLIELEA

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:18:32 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 623

Login: toyond

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:44:27 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 624

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:48:38 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 625

Login: Fungirl

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:49:48 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 626

Login: EDC

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:51:27 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 627

Login: Kam

Responded Mar 03, 2017 20:51:59 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 628

Login: shawsand

Responded Mar 03, 2017 21:40:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 629

Login: Gurjitm

Responded Mar 03, 2017 23:07:39 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Putting limitations on houses limits the variety in the types of homes built in Richmond. By putting on limits, you are limiting the creative freedom of someone to build their dream home, that could be to house their multigenerational family. Nowadays, many young families cannot live on their own and need to live with their parents or grandparents and decreasing house sizes puts an end to that. It puts on a limit to how big of a family you can have. Yes green space is important but currently every house does have front and back green space. There are already adequate requirements that do not need further changing.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 630

Responded Mar 04, 2017 00:07:29 am

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):



Respondent No: 631

Login: dupiotto

Responded Mar 04, 2017 05:56:39 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Facebook



Respondent No: 632

Login: Jody

Responded Mar 04, 2017 07:08:07 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 633

Login: Haylee

Responded Mar 04, 2017 07:41:39 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 634

Login: Mikegnet

Responded Mar 04, 2017 07:52:13 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 635

Login: Jay S

Responded Mar 04, 2017 09:23:08 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 636

Login: Myu882

Responded Mar 04, 2017 10:04:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 637

Login: EmilyZ

Responded Mar 04, 2017 11:03:17 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 638

Responded Mar 04, 2017 12:22:38 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 639

Login: CPW

Responded Mar 04, 2017 12:27:18 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Saw poster in City facility



Respondent No: 640

Login: Wng0125

Responded Mar 04, 2017 13:59:53 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Type of trees allowed planted should be specified. I have a neighbour who has planted planted weed which hits my house every year and the leaves all land on my yard, and not theirs. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: The entry gates really serve no purpose from the security stand point. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Height of new properties being built affect drainage in neighbouring properties and can cause flooding. Please consider existing properties that have to incur extra costs due to lack of foresight for drainage. New developments should have their own drainage to draw away from surrounding low lying properties that were fine before.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 641

Login: Avatar

Responded Mar 04, 2017 14:32:58 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 642

Responded Mar 04, 2017 15:56:18 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Facebook



Respondent No: 643

Login: frankz

Responded Mar 04, 2017 16:01:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 644

Login: Ria1

Responded Mar 04, 2017 16:08:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | <p>Trees should be selected and planted to minimize debris entering a neighbour's gutter. They should also be planted in such a way that the roots of the mature tree do not damage driveways, walkways and foundations of neighbouring houses, or clog the soil to prevent the planting of gardens.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Restrictions should apply on main roads and side roads with sideways. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please place a height restriction on houses to match the neighbourhood in which the house is being built. If the neighbourhood consists of two-storey houses, then limit to two-storeys. If the neighbourhood is three-storey townhouses, then limit to three-storeys. New neighbourhoods should be limited to three-storeys. No house should be greater than 8000 sf.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 645

Login: Chetan

Responded Mar 04, 2017 16:36:17 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

The present set back is appropriate and accepted by all the neighbourhood therefore appropriate.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 646

Login: mannyjanda

Responded Mar 04, 2017 16:54:08 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

It will affect 3 car garages, most homes do require them. Nicely landscaped homes with 20 feet rear exposure is enough of a backyard and distance from the neighbor.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 647

Login: phb

Responded Mar 04, 2017 17:12:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 648

Login: RGoodchild

Responded Mar 04, 2017 17:30:08 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
I prefer whichever option allows maximum area for the green space on the lot.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | In general I support options that decrease or limit house size and the amount of the lot that is covered. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | Tree sizes should also be considered as many large trees are being replaced by very small trees or trees far from the neighbourhood. This is decreasing habitat for birds in city neighbourhoods and makes the built-up environment less appealing with more pavement, less foliage. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am primarily concerned with providing limits on the mass of the building on a lot than any of the specific details. We seem to be building a city with massive houses and lots of pavement, with few trees. Considering the trend to global warming, it would seem wise to also consider ways to improve drainage, perhaps by increasing boulevard plantings or use of alternate permeable surfaces such as gravel instead of all pavement. Building more massive houses that remain empty is also having a negative impact on many communities where schools may be faced with closure. Safety in communities with lots of large empty houses also is making these communities less desirable for those who remain here. Are there other policies that would promote building the types of family homes that many families can no longer find in Richmond?

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 649

Login: Kluu

Responded Mar 04, 2017 17:47:18 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 650

Login: Mytalk

Responded Mar 04, 2017 17:47:47 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 651

Login: RBM

Responded Mar 04, 2017 17:51:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 652

Login: Immica

Responded Mar 04, 2017 20:03:32 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 653

Login: Frau

Responded Mar 04, 2017 20:06:26 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 654

Responded Mar 04, 2017 20:07:57 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 655

Login: Ellie

Responded Mar 04, 2017 20:53:46 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 656

Login: s66

Responded Mar 04, 2017 20:58:20 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

On narrow lots(those made from splitting one wider lot) the new home is already narrow you can't create an indent of the footprint, then house would only be around 15' wide at the indent.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The homes built all around my old house are all 6m setback,I should be able to build the same as what is already built around me.On a long thin lot, a large rear setback combined with a potential pushing of any gates at the front 20ft from the front property line would result in a very short house of useless over square footage.Also merely using the lot depth to calculate rear setback isn't fair to narrower lots as they don't have the lot width to compensate for housing design.

Q10.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No (retain status quo)

Q11.Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

I like trees,I have many on my property,however I feel it should be the home owners choice if they want trees fine if not then fine also, not overrun with overzealous rules regarding trees which actually makes people not want to plant any as once they are there on the property were if they become too big & push into they house etc it becomes too difficult to deal with all the rules so people don't want any trees,more reasonable rules would actually encourage more people to have trees if they knew they could deal with it later if the tree was a problem.Richmond 50+ years ago had very few trees,alot of people talk as if Richmond was some sort of forest years ago but that wasn't the case it was flat farmland with hardly any trees. make the bylaws for cutting down & trimming,easier and people would plant more knowing they aren't trapped.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

If the entry gates are pushed back 20ft from the property line,then you will have people parking cars all over the lawn on the area between the gate and the street,which will look worse than if the gates remained in the original spot closer to the street.It already is happening all over my street with gates that are closer to the house,the lawn just becomes a parking lot.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
|---|------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The main issue I have with the proposed changes is what about people like myself who own an older house(built 1968,I've lived here since 1969) that is currently surrounded on all sides by newer homes that have been built per the current regulations (6m setback) so I feel if a new home was built on my lot it should be the same as the other newer homes built around it not suddenly subject to completely different rules than the others that have been built next to it,my house as it currently stands has been devalued as a home because of the buildings built around it,so that leaves me with with a future sale at a devalued price because of the surrounding buildings or a new build on the property to match the surrounding buildings. Now it is proposed to change the rules putting me at a disadvantage compared to new homes already built next door,something I was told would not happen when I questioned city council about this very matter when the proposal for the surrounding buildings was put forward by the builder,I was told that the new buildings were within city code and therefore I could do nothing about it,and that in the future if I was to build I would be under the same rules,these new proposed changes are in conflict with that and that is not right . The homes next to mine are built under the old rules I should be able to build the exact same home as next door to me. These lots are the long narrow type, under the recent rules proposed for building height and design the narrower lots were allowed to remain per the current rules due to lack of flexibility in the home design due to the lot shape,I feel this should also be reflected in any proposed changes now and that narrower lots be exempt from any change in rules and remain as currently allowed. My whole street(except for mine) has been rebuilt with new homes under the current rules why suddenly change it now?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|--|---------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43.Please specify: | not answered |
|----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story |
|---|-----------------|



Respondent No: 657

Login: Kailan

Responded Mar 04, 2017 21:44:51 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.**

Yes

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)**

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House**

not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

Site coverage is far too high causing increased risk of flood danger from higher runoff. Yard space virtually non existent.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.**

Yes

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)**

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

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback**

not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

not answered

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.**

Yes

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks**

not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Even the City of Vancouver has better limits on new home heights and sizes to protect loss of privacy and light for existing homes then does the City of Richmond!

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 658

Login: nataly

Responded Mar 04, 2017 21:45:43 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 659

Responded Mar 04, 2017 21:49:43 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Present guidelines allow for too much site coverage, compared with houses that already make up the established neighborhoods. Livability, shade and privacy are compromised when adjacent properties are re developed.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

New houses are too close to rear property lines, especially those that max out building and ceiling heights.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

What governs accessory building square footage and max height.?

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Current house construction is comical with the angles and profiles of building ladders in nearly minimal spaces. Where is workspace BC in this, how about fire protection. Questioned at your open house, I was told that they approve based on no windows, that doesn't appear to take affect in most cases of new construction, where there appears to have a lot of openings in this side yard areas. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Anything to increase privacy, | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Too much hard landscaping occurs now, we are supposed to be greening the world not paving it, | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| At a minimum. The more canopy the better. We have allowed to much removal and non replacement already. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Can't understand why we need gates and walls anyway. Most of the time they just stop and impede other traffic when they are activated, | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| Anything more than 2 cars imposes on neighbors and street at side yards, especially when the garage has "rooms" above it. The more front garage coverage forces the bulk of the hose into the rear yard space. | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

Would be nice if there was some provision, additional setbacks from rear propertyline when properties are raised to suit flood plan rules, such as along #2 Road. This would give these properties adjoining (which already exist and remain at the lower level) the privacy that they have always had and become a custom too.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 660

Login: IC

Responded Mar 04, 2017 22:27:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 661

Login: Harish

Responded Mar 04, 2017 22:34:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Houses are built too tall and too close to the boundary.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Loss of privacy and light are important considerations.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| At four feet, the side yard is too small. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| There needs to be more green space around the home. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 662

Login: rmelevatn

Responded Mar 04, 2017 22:44:15 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | I think the requirement should be two trees on the lot, doesn't matter whether both are in the front yard, both in the back yard, or one in the front yard and one in the back yard. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 663

Login: zhengsa

Responded Mar 04, 2017 22:48:25 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 664

Login: bubblybat

Responded Mar 04, 2017 23:31:51 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I have lived in Richmond all my life. I grew up in the Westwind area. When I was a child you would go outside and play. I knew all my neighbours (whether they had children or not). On the court I live on more than 50% of the houses have been torn down to be rebuilt. I still know my neighbours because the new houses built have lawns, trees, small garages and back yards. Some of the newer ones are monsters. Home isn't just about the building you live in. It's about the community you live in.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 665

Login: weiwei

Responded Mar 04, 2017 23:32:41 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

An amendment to limit the maximum physical depth of a house will cause interior way too long and less effective space to be utilized. So I don't agree this amendment. And make rear yard looking smaller.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

The option 2 makes rear yard look larger space. I agree option 2. Option 3 makes the house look more similar square shape and it makes the interior space darker. Fail to provide sufficient light.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: The options reduce the maximum area that can be covered by buildings will increase the second floor area and the house looks higher and more massive under no reducing the whole floor area. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

At least two trees are in a lot.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

The house adjacent to main street that no space park should be option 2. Remain one park space.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

A front entry gate is allowed, but better be setback 4.8 m (16 ft) from the front property line and remain an access to side yard.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

In my opinion, to resolve the massive house, first, we should reduce the amount of attic space, current some attic waste more space. Using a part of attic space should be rewarded to the total floor area according to certain proportion. And second reduce the area rate that the ceiling high is 4.8 m. Limit to use in the one of the living room and family room. Could keep stairway higher above. Advocate to build the ranch style ceiling and determine an average ceiling high in 4.8 m (16 ft). A part of space could be above 4.8 m (16 ft) and the other part must be below 4.8 m (16 ft).

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 666

Login: Mmmm

Responded Mar 05, 2017 00:49:30 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| I am against Option 3, as it will encourage the development of houses that are ugly, plain boxes. Option 2 will encourage houses to be developed with some character. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Further to this, there should be a minimum size requirement for the newly-planted trees, so that developers don't put in a two-foot tall tree, rather than an 8-foot tree which won't die as easily, and will provide a meaningful improvement to the neighbourhood in just a few years.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 667

Login: APAP

Responded Mar 05, 2017 07:06:14 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

We need to think long term about the future of Richmond. The monster houses coming up around my neighbourhood (one across the street from us, one behind us, and one next to us, one over) impact our neighbourhood. We currently are a neighbourhood where people look out for others, garden in our yard, have neighbourhood barbecues, and watch out for each others' children and property. Monster houses do not support this community as there is little motivation for being outside of your home.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 668

Login: SaveRichmond

Responded Mar 05, 2017 09:01:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please save Richmond from any more destruction. This has been such a slap in the face to long term residents. Seeing hideously large (and empty) homes encroaching is a sickening feeling. Our property has now been impacted too as our garden has lost its privacy with a castle overlooking us from behind. Our senior neighbours who have lived in their home for FORTY years have now had their home and yard's privacy obliterated by the same castle. It is obscene. This should NEVER have been allowed. So terribly sad.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Word of mouth |
|--|----------------------------------|



Respondent No: 669

Login: Dianne

Responded Mar 05, 2017 09:03:34 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
minimize shading in neighbour's back yard
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Again, minimizing access to sunlight
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Maximize privacy and allow space for shrubs |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | smaller lot coverage to promote more greenery |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | If not a requirement, some people would not plant any greenery |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Who wants to live in a community of paved front yards and gates which detract from a sense of community, neighbourliness and exclusivity. I certainly don't. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: reduce flooding damage to existing neighbours | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Quality of life factors include feeling part of one's community and not to feel isolated. Large, gated, ostentatious homes promote isolation and highlight discrepancy in incomes which work against a sense of well being and trust in one's environment.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Newspaper story Word of mouth |
|--|----------------------------------|



Respondent No: 670

Login: Barbs

Responded Mar 05, 2017 09:47:43 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 671

Login: myvoice

Responded Mar 05, 2017 10:03:24 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I am in favour of reducing the size of the homes that are being built. Monster homes have got to be reduced, significantly and we need trees on the lots.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 672
Login: aBetterRichmond

Responded Mar 05, 2017 10:13:13 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: A large dog could easily jump over a 4 foot gate, whether my own dog or someone else's so I am against restricting a pedestrian gate. However, mechanical driveway gates should be eliminated all together. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 673
Login: Celebrate Steveston

Responded Mar 05, 2017 10:22:25 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 674

Login: Kellyolak

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:06:43 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 675

Login: Makhan

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:21:20 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 676

Login: xing

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:23:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 677

Login: Dar

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:26:56 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 678

Login: jay13

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:29:37 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | I support the side yard setback, however do not support any additional rear yard setback as there is already a rear yard setback in place. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

This survey should have been sent out to every Richmond land owner, not have land owners, who are not involved with development or building on an annual basis, go out and look for it. It should've been treated the same way you treated the ALR amendments. I've spoken to a half dozen home owners (not renters) and they are not aware of any of these amendments.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 679

Login: amberolak

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:31:45 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 680

Login: Jayda

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:40:38 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 681

Login: Priya

Responded Mar 05, 2017 11:46:46 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 682

Login: pseid

Responded Mar 05, 2017 12:01:54 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 683

Login: zhangbob

Responded Mar 05, 2017 12:26:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No Opinion
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 684

Responded Mar 05, 2017 12:35:38 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Richmond house's look beautiful and make me feel I live in a very rich community and housing values reflect that let's not shoot our selves in the foot by changing something that is not broken

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 685

Login: kayess17

Responded Mar 05, 2017 12:42:52 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 686

Login: pontifex

Responded Mar 05, 2017 13:07:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: I prefer option 3, however I believe that there should be some differentiation based on width of lot. For example, if the lot is 40ft (12.2m) or less at the property line I can see the requirement being onerous, but at 50 ft, this becomes a non-issue. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 687

Login: Rhonda

Responded Mar 05, 2017 13:59:00 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | I agree with side yard setback for the deck, however, I don't agree with any additional rear yard set back. The rear yard setback is already adequate. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Parking is an issue on small lots. Eventually you will receive a lot more complaints about the lack of street parking. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Parking will be a problem. Blocking the driveway with cars parked outside the gate. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: 3rd garage bay required for off street parking. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

People on streets with large houses - like mine - will loose value if they are not allowed to build similar homes between.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 688

Login: wenwen

Responded Mar 05, 2017 14:12:14 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 689

Login: Doris

Responded Mar 05, 2017 14:35:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I found this to be a poorly designed survey, likely not to be easily understood, nor completed by an average Richmond resident. I would question the validity of the results due to the likelihood there will not be significant number of surveys completed

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 690

Login: dschuette

Responded Mar 05, 2017 15:13:32 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 691

Login: ACT

Responded Mar 05, 2017 15:32:05 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

not answered

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Why are you asking me to choose between Option 2 and 3? Option 2 would be a big improvement for the neighbours when the building lot is small. Option 3 would be preferable on a deep lot.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 692

Login: newsjunkie

Responded Mar 05, 2017 16:16:09 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We appreciate the opportunity for input. Were not aware so many aspects of building were unregulated.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 693

Login: slamz

Responded Mar 05, 2017 16:24:49 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 694

Login: meeresgp1

Responded Mar 05, 2017 16:29:36 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No Opinion |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 695

Login: samantha

Responded Mar 05, 2017 16:33:13 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

size and position of new builds should not negatively impact existing homes in regards to backyard privacy and natural light

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 696

Login: a.larsen

Responded Mar 05, 2017 16:53:21 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 697

Login: Icare

Responded Mar 05, 2017 17:01:37 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: The massive houses that are being allowed in my area have blocked some sun and definitely my views. My backyard garden no longer receives full range of sunshine in the summer due to the great heights and deck projections of these houses (where no one lives). | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 698

Login: Jason T

Responded Mar 05, 2017 17:02:40 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I live at [REDACTED]. I encourage you to come have a look at my backyard and see the THREE massive 3-story houses that the City has allowed to be built on Pelican Court. It has ruined much of the enjoyment my own property. Thanks!

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 699

Login: weida

Responded Mar 05, 2017 17:27:35 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Twitter



Respondent No: 700

Responded Mar 05, 2017 17:37:51 pm

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below) | not answered |
| Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House | not answered |
| Q4. Comments: | not answered |
| Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below) | not answered |
| Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback | not answered |
| Q9. Comments: | not answered |
| Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q12. Comments: | not answered |
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: The City needs to stop making 'blanket Bylaw changes'. RS1/A zones should not be treated the same as RS1/E or AG1. There is no consideration for the nuances of the neighborhoods. Many are working just fine as they are. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 701

Login: Savagerosie

Responded Mar 05, 2017 18:22:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 702

Login: Sylvia1234

Responded Mar 05, 2017 18:24:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 703

Login: SG

Responded Mar 05, 2017 19:03:03 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 704

Login: Kal

Responded Mar 05, 2017 19:17:00 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No Opinion
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No Opinion |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 705

Login: daryl

Responded Mar 05, 2017 19:27:57 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 706

Login: yaqing

Responded Mar 05, 2017 19:37:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 707

Login: shelleys43

Responded Mar 05, 2017 19:39:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I believe that by making these amendments it will have a less negative effect on neighbourhoods when new homes replace older homes. Developers may have to change from the stock plans that they are currently using, but spacious homes can still be built with the new guidelines and fit better into existing neighbourhoods where people care about their yards, their privacy and natural light in their homes and yards.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth |
|--|---------------|



Respondent No: 708

Login: lkoch

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:01:17 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 709

Login: neighbor

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:08:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 710

Login: Tplath

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:15:42 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 711

Login: Davel

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:16:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Houses are too big for our neighbourhoods!
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
We need back yards again!
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Outbuildings take away greenspace.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|--|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| Houses are too big and too close together. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| We are losing all our neighbourhood trees and plants at an alarming rate. Very unhealthy. Trees and shrubs are our city's lungs. We want greenery. What about our birds? Our bees? | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

This should have been done years ago. The trees need to be of a certain size, no small trees allowed. And where are our street trees? All the money that is going into the tree fund needs to be put back into the same neighbourhoods where trees are removed. We shouldn't have to go to a park to enjoy trees.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

I want a neighbourhood that I enjoy walking in, with trees and shrubs.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

Gates and fences are horrible unsightly additions to new houses. Trees die as a result also.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

New Garages are excessive and take away our street greenspace.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

I thought building heights were lowered last year, but I don't see it with new buildings built recently. New houses tower over older houses and you should be protecting older houses.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

New houses have changed our neighbourhoods, and not for the better. Shame, shame. You need to protect and respect older homes and setbacks, protect trees and greenspace. Money should not come first. So so many trees already lost, so many flowering shrubs too. We will be losing more trees and greenspace with the new arterial plan. We don't need more townhouses, we need protection for single family homes and our trees.

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 712

Login: Westwind

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:30:23 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

When we chose to live in Richmond we were influenced by the attractive and well planned communities. The wonderful landscaping at that time was also a factor in our decision. Sadly it is now disappearing at a very rapid rate. Our once Garden City - Richmond is no more. What a legacy!

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 713

Login: mozzie

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:36:11 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 714

Login: Felix the cat

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:37:34 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

A limit of max depth is needed to provide each other's privacy. Not blocking the sunlight of each other.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

a min rear yard setback is needed because neighbourhood loses privacy and feels crowded.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.

Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| No house would like to be crowded by their neighbours. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| Privacy is very important and greenery is needed to be built for privacy. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No Opinion |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Greenery is needed to maintain the beauty of the house and neighbourhood. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Min setback of entry gate is needed to prevent cars blocking the pedestrian sidewalk and possibly the car on the road. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 715

Login: LMK

Responded Mar 05, 2017 20:46:43 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 716

Login: Steph

Responded Mar 05, 2017 21:22:12 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** not answered
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | not answered |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | not answered |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | not answered |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

this survey actually is hard to read and is very small print in the pictures so I cant see what im answering, so ill just say this. I support as much green space as possible on a lot.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 717

Login: Sahm

Responded Mar 05, 2017 21:47:38 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Twitter



Respondent No: 718

Login: xiaora

Responded Mar 05, 2017 21:54:05 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 719

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:39:35 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

It is understandable why certain residents in this city feel the need to voice their opinion and concern regarding the way homes are built in this city. A fraction of new homes being built in the city lack a proper vision of planning and design. That being said, the approach city staff are taking to tackle the "issue" at hand is not adequate, similar to the last building by law changes last year. Just like homes cannot follow a "cookie-cutter" strategy (those that do are the ones that begin discussions like this in the first place), major bylaw changes and building guidelines cannot not either. Imposing building guidelines across the board to all properties regardless of specific neighbourhood/area is irrational. If we take a moment to look at other major municipalities locally, nationally and even across the world, building/construction guidelines and specifications very depending on neighbourhoods and areas. There are many factors that come into play when deciding how buildings are to be constructed on specific parcels of lands. The city of Richmond must take a similar approach. This city has a ton of potential; beyond what certain residents in this municipality can handle. The changes that have been made, and those that can potentially be made, are cutting short whatever potential would be realized in the future. That being said, this city needs to take a proper long term approach in handling this situation. If changes must be made, they must be made based on what is best for the city. Impose area specific building bylaws that limit specific things based on the neighbourhoods the homes exist in.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply) | A Richmond resident |
|---|---------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Q43. Please specify: | not answered |
|-----------------------------|--------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply): | Word of mouth Saw poster in City facility |
|--|--|



Respondent No: 720

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:42:17 pm

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I would rather the bylaw go back to the way it was originally before the status quo. The houses built today are not as attractive as the ones that were built before.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

I would prefer the status quo to remain.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

No Opinion

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q13.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: The side yard setbacks are good the way they are because they leave enough width to access without much issue. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments If an issue of privacy is being brought up, I can tell you right now that from a sundeck in the above rendering, a person will easily be able to look into the neighbours backyard without an issue. In fact many of the older homes let someone look into a neighbours backyard already. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: The current landscaping plan seems vast enough. We are still able to plant many trees, and grass to make a property look attractive. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |

**Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.Comments:

I can't even think of one home in recent memory that didn't have atleast 2 trees on the property. It is alarming to me that the city staff has proposed such a scenario because it means how out of touch they are from what's actually happening. It seems as if they are simply listening to complaints that have zero merit. They are drafting up these plans without any consideration.

**Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

**Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

not answered

**Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.Comments:

not answered

**Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

No

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

This will cause more vehicles to be parked on the street. Many of the residents that live in the luxury homes have more than 2 vehicles. You are literally ruining our open streets by proposing this.

**Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

**Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

not answered

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

not answered

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** No (retain status quo)

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

If you come into a home you can see that the ceiling blocks the view from the top of the stairs. It looks stupid. I would love to invite you over to see what I mean.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

On the Whole, I believe that you must consider everything you are proposing. It seems as if you are listening to a small but loud minority of people who are completely out of touch with how homes are built. The mini-mansions that many people have come to detest so much are indirectly attributed to why property value has gone up as much as it did. This boom from immigrants and development in general literally gave people retirements that they didnt have before. Make a city bylaw neighbourhood by neighbourhood. Everything else is a God awful waste of time.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond builder/developer

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca



Respondent No: 721

Login: Brigrtn

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:42:30 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No Opinion |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 722

Login: Navdeep

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:47:53 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 723

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:56:11 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Retain Status Quo
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Retain status quo
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Retain status quo
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: retain status quo | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments retain status quo | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: retain status quo | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: retain status quo | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: retain status quo | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: retain status quo | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: retain status quo | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: retain status quo | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Approach to make changes is flawed. Need to go back to drawing board and figure out an adequate long term approach.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 724

Login: Bille

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:58:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 725

Login: elaineece

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:59:29 pm

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Ideally, there would be even less, as backyards are disappearing and trees are being cut to so that these massive homes can be built.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Even when the set back is based on the lot depth the city should create regulations to make sure that backyards are bigger than 20 feet. Most people move to the suburbs to have a backyard. It is unacceptable that the city provides such minimal standards to preserve green space in the back and front of houses. This negates the previous residents's rights to privacy, sunshine and open space.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments No decks on the second floor overlooking other people's yards, please. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

This would counteract the bylaw that allows people to cut one tree each year. The thing is, with backyard set backs of 20 feet, where are the trees going to grow?

Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.

Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped

Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements not answered

Q30.Comments:

The more green space the better, especially because grass would soften the austerity of mega homes.

Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

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

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates not answered

Q33.Comments:

Are entry gates necessary? They contradict the general designs of the open lawn concepts. Gates are for sheer design and feeling of security. Anyone can jump over them. Why have them in the first place?

Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Yes

Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.

Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections not answered

Q37.Comments:

Ideally there would be no projections. With the houses being excessively big, projecting garages is not necessary. They are bulky!

Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning No Opinion

Bylaw for the measurement of building height.

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

I recommend more severe changes, as the tower houses are becoming a norm!

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

I am disappointed at the city's slow response to the proliferation of mega homes. It is a betrayal to tax payers, and to the architectural visions of established neighborhoods. The mega owner's comfort and greed destroy the sunshine, privacy and interfere with the aesthetics of neighborhoods. The city is developer friendly, doing too little and being too slow.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 726

Responded Mar 05, 2017 22:59:54 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 727

Login: Sher

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:06:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 728

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:11:10 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 3: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 7.3 m (24 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Facebook

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 729

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:22:43 pm

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 730

Login: mokoeito

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:24:56 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No Opinion

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Facebook



Respondent No: 731

Login: Gursher

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:39:22 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Retain status quo
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Retain status quo
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
Retain status quo
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: Retain status quo | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments Retain status quo | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: Retain status quo | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: Retain status quo | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Retain status quo | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Retain status quo | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Retain status quo | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Retain status quo | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

error

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 732

Login: Shiu

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:47:29 pm

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 733

Login: Mbp

Responded Mar 05, 2017 23:56:54 pm

At:

Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered

Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered

Q4. **Comments:**

No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended.

Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered

Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered

Q9. **Comments:**

No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended.

Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)

Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered

Q12. **Comments:**

No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended.

Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| No changes should take place until land use contracts are amended. Plant trees on city boulevard. | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| One tree is enough. | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: What if entry gate set back is passed back to twenty feet and option 4 is applied. My truck will not fit safely behind the gate. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Letting the city decide your average site grade is subjective to what mood the plan checker is in that day | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The previous building envelopes should have been sufficient if the city only followed their own guidelines. All of these changes and land use contracts are protected for years to come. Only a city where 80% of the population doesn't care or can comprehend building bylaws could this ever happen.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 734

Login: Lucy

Responded Mar 06, 2017 00:17:49 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
Prefer minimum of greater of 6.0m or 25% of total depth up to max required setback of 10.7 m
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

Recent realtors seem to plant trees too close for sales pitch during infancy but grows too large/tall that it brushes against windows/walls/roofs of new homes, causing possible danger/hazard to tree & building (also costly if tree to be removed). Depending on tree/shrub type, probably give minimum 1-2 metre radius away from building/fence boundary to allow growth and easy tree maintenance

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|---|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

not answered

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 735

Login: JMatheson

Responded Mar 06, 2017 00:28:46 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website



Respondent No: 736

Login: mukh

Responded Mar 06, 2017 01:02:15 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
this will not help achieve anything what happens to all the existing built homes..
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
this option 2 will provide for better sunlight in the back yard and privacy
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
another not so bright idea it will take up all of the back yard and limit landscaping opportunities.
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| | it is good to have one projection for gas fireplace |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| | the concept on paper sounds good but will not work on site and will not help privacy issues. city policy to show they are doing something as always.. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| | city planning should talk to the city inspectors and the homes hardly meet the status quo option |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| | once again this has nothing to do with the massing issue |

| | |
|--|---|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 2: Minimum of 50% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30.Comments: good idea | |
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33.Comments: once again nothing to do with the massing referral, another attempt of fooling the public the gates proposal will not work at 20ft into the property, this is one way telling the public the city does not want electric gates, which they legally cannot stop.. | |
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37.Comments: another non massing issue, pressure from Westwind group. | |
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No Opinion |
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40.Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

The city has taken the concerns of the westwind group and put them on fancy boards, this does not represent the rest of the public. if westwind prefer these changes they can ask the city to try it in there area as a pilot project, i assure you after one year the many people will come back to the city and wanted these changed reverted as it will de-value there house prices. When LUC lots were discharged westwind residents wanted specific zoning in there own area, i wonder why? City should open there eyes and stop catering to the few that only care about themselves and not the community as a whole.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 737
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:10:11 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

not answered

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 738
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:11:47 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 739
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:23:20 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Current new home allowances contribute to the proliferation of unsightly, oversized houses ruining existing family neighbourhoods.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Rear yard setbacks should be greater than 6.0 metres.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

I would prefer that the minimum setback for any accessory building be 2.4 metres - regardless of the size of that accessory building.

| | |
|---|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: There are no valid reasons for projections on new houses. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Second storey decks must be setback a minimum of 1.5 metres inside of the rear yard and side yard setbacks for the main walls of the house. | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: The new regulations for site coverage should emphasize the need for more live landscaping and less hard ground surfaces. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

**Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New
Single Family Building Permits**

not answered

Q26.Comments:

Retention of existing mature trees should be enforced; replacing these mature trees with new small trees is not acceptable.

**Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to require a minimum area of
front yard landscaping for single
family dwellings.**

Yes

**Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 15 below)**

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

**Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard
Landscaping Requirements**

not answered

Q30.Comments:

Landscaping for new houses should be restricted to indigenous plants and trees/shrubs/hedging; not ornamental, non-native plants/trees. No Palm Trees, for instance.

**Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to
a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and
a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from
the front property line.**

Yes

Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates

not answered

Q33.Comments:

There is no real need for entry gates, nor for the associated concrete fences/bulky walls currently being built. These structures reduce lot area available for live landscaping.

**Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning
Bylaw to limit the forward projection
of an attached garage.**

Yes

**Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see
Board 17 below)**

Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.)

Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections

not answered

Q37.Comments:

Garages do not need to accommodate any more than 2 cars.

Q38. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39. **Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40. **Comments:**

The allowable building height for the new houses that are currently being built is excessive. Such over-height houses ruin neighbourhoods and destroy the privacy of existing family homes.

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

It is critically important that Richmond create and enforce regulations that reverse the status quo for new detached house design and construction over the past 10 years. It is not acceptable to continue to allow oversized new houses to be built that overwhelm all other neighbouring homes, eliminate mature trees and landscaping, ruin neighbour relations, reduce the privacy of adjacent existing family homes and property while catering to builders and investors' desires. I urge Richmond's Mayor and Council and staff to promptly enact regulations to reverse the building design practices that have imposed "monster houses" on previously attractive neighbourhoods throughout our City. Thank you.

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident
Other

Q43. **Please specify:** Longtime Richmond Taxpayer

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
City of Richmond website: www.richmond.ca
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 740
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:26:19 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
6 m should be the minimum rear yard setback.
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| New houses should not have any projections. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| not answered | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| Focus on keeping mature trees. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please stop mega houses from being built in our neighbourhoods!

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 741
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:29:24 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Leave the status quo alone! OR offer restrictions to individual subdivisions. My name is:

My e-mail address is:

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 742
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:31:26 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Leave the status quo alone! OR offer restrictions to individual subdivisions. My name is: [REDACTED] My
e-mail is: [REDACTED]

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story
LetsTalkRichmond.ca website
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 743
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:39:27 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

33% of total lot depth like the house I currently live in. This allows for privacy and large trees for landscaping for birds and other animals and a garden.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Rear yard setback of 40 feet on the ground floor and for the second or half storey for 100% of the backyard not just a portion of the backyard. This is to retain mature trees and allow for more trees to be planted and to enable more privacy from your neighbours.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Increase side setbacks to

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: not answered | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Total site coverage of 40%; landscaping of live plants to be 60%. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

I think this should be 4 trees at least.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

Minimum of 90% of the required front yard should be landscaped. Driveway filling the whole front yard should never be allowed.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

I would like to see a bylaw restricting unwelcoming entry gates and walls.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Car garages should be a standard front facing 2 car garage.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

What would really be effective is to reduce the overheight standard of a house to 12 feet. I would like to see an increase of greenspace and live landscaping. I would like the houses to be lower in height. I think new houses should be the same foot print as the ones torn down. My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 744
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:46:18 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | People have more cars now and needs space for parking. It will not be good if all the cars have to park on the road. Nice landscaping doesn't depend on size, it depends on how to care. |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: Parking inside/within the lot is better than parking along the street making the road narrower and dangerous. | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: It does not make sense. Maximum height of 4 ft. is OK but setback is definitely not as it is very hard to put a gate which also served the purpose of security. Gate does not affect neighbourhood relationship, but it will deter thief. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |

Q40.Comments:

not answered

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Please send notice to all Richmond household about any change and issue the City wants to impose. Thanks. Using a residential lot for other uses such as renting out rooms and other commercial uses should be fined and prohibited with no exception. My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42.I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.Please specify:

not answered

Q44.I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 745
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:48:39 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

Stop build high rise and improve the traffic in No. 3 Road, Garden City Road and No. 2 Road.

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 746
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:56:41 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Banning gates will lead to a more friendly community. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: Stop rubber stamping 3 car garages. Save this 250 split as green space. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: If there are changes they must be compatible with existing area. | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

This feedback form is ridiculous (sp.)! I do not support rezoning changes in my area without them being agreed to and attractive for our SFN. To ask "I support an amendment" in each section is a leading suggestion and I feel insulting.

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 747
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 08:58:57 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 748
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:09:36 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Majority of subdivision lots are not very deep. Avg. lot size depth is between 110 - 120. No need to regulate depth.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

No (retain status quo - Option 1)

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

not answered

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

Average lots are not very deep therefore no need of second floor rear setback.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

not answered

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Bay window in 1.2 m side setback should not be allowed. Bay windows should always have winding in front and sides if side yard is minimum 1.5 m to 2 m. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: not answered | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |

Q26.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q27.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q28.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q29.Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q30.Comments:

No need to change present %

| | |
|--|----|
| Q31.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Q32.Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

Q33.Comments:

not answered

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Q34.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q35.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Q36.Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
|--|--------------|

Q37.Comments:

Majority of lots in subdivision are not very deep. 6m front yard is good. No need to change front yard.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q38.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | not answered |
|---|--------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Q39.Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
|---|--------------|

Q40.Comments:

Building height should be measured from 1st floor slab. No need or averaging grade. Or from finished grade.

Q41.Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

I do not support any changes to zoning bylaw. In 2015 City changed ceiling height, building envelope and building height. Certainly by the new 2015 bylaw massing of building was reduced by introduction of max 16'4" of ceiling, trusses supported on wall plate. Building height was reduced from mid point of roof to top of ride height. Side yard setback for second storey was increased for +65' wider lots. Please do not change any bylaw, in face I request to change building height measurement should be taken from 1st floor slab or finish grade. *Remove average grade calculation. Minimum first storey slab elevation should be from 1'0" to 2'-" above crown of road or average four corners of lot. This will allow to slope the grade at front and rear. My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

**Q42.I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer
Other

Q43.Please specify:

Richmond House Designer

**Q44.I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 749
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:13:31 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Volume is a better measurement to limit house size.
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | |
| If projections are allowed side setbacks should be increased to 5 feet. | |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | |
| No decks should be allowed to overlook neighbours house. | |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 2: 42% coverage; total site coverage of 65%; 25% to 35% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | |
| not answered | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: This should not exceed the average of the fronts of other houses on the block. | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: The height should be restricted to 16' (wall size) above the next door lot level. | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 750
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:16:53 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 751
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:18:39 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 752
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:21:12 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 753
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:22:47 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 754
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:31:59 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 755
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:33:48 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 756
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:36:30 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 757
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:38:27 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 758
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:40:39 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 759
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:42:28 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 760
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:44:01 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 761
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:53:48 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 2: Limit house depth to 55% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 2: Rear yard setback of 6 m (20 ft.) on the ground floor and 7.5 m (25 ft.) for second or half storey
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: This is not an issue if the lot in question has enough off road boulevard space to accommodate a car full of the road ROW | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 2: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 9.1 m (30 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story
Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 762
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 09:56:55 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Under 9 metre | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 763
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:00:51 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Should be less than 9 metres | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 764
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:11:19 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Lower than 9 metre | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 765
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:12:52 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 766
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:14:52 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: Prefer no gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 767
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:16:42 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 768
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:18:47 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Prefer less than 9 metre height | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 769
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:21:14 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate please | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 770
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:22:59 am

At:



- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 771
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:24:54 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 772
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:26:30 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 773
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:28:07 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 774
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:29:57 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: Lower than 9 metre | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 775
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:31:57 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Should be 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 776
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:47:32 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

I would support a house depth of even less than 50% of total lot depth but the way this council works, I'd be surprised if we even get the other choice.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

What were you people thinking when you allowed the zoning bylaws we have today. They are exorbitant and there is no valid reason why such a state of Richmond affairs to have happened.

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

I had had access to information that says wheelchair, etc. could not navigate the setbacks currently allowed.

| | |
|--|--|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: Shame on all who permitted Richmond to become what it is today an enclave for the rich and possibly corrupt, dirty money, greed seeking people we have catered to and aided and abetted what is Richmond today. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments not answered | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: This question is misleading in my opinion; I support the maximum of landscaping, garden and/or trees, etc. | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q25. Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26. Comments: | |
| A minimum of 2 trees for each lot is not sufficient considering the fact that the lot was probably clear cut and denuded of trees to begin with. | |
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: | |
| not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: | |
| Just come and look at 8300 Williams Road and you will see the fence is solid black but can be levered open to allow cars and is at least 6' in height. What a terrible sight. (Tree hedge planted a few years ago) (Entrance door with electronic door opened). | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: | |
| These huge houses and the people who build them go against all logic. | |

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q39.**Board 18 - Measuring Building Height** not answered

Q40.**Comments:**

I take walks in the evening on Piggott Road off Williams and see all the smaller houses are gone. What is in place are huge, dead houses (i.e., dark huge and gloomy) with no inhabitants. "Dead Neighbourhoods".

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

Whole neighbourhoods have gone by the wayside with the current zoning. I understand you (the Council) tried in years gone by to do something about the state of things and caved in when developers, etc. arrived in big numbers to oppose it. I hope you stand up for what makes sense this time and is right for Richmond's quality of life and health and well-being. Please do not 'cave-in' this time. People in bygone days had many children but 12 up to 22 bedrooms is greatly beyond a single-family home. You know it and have let these people (developers, etc.) to walk all over you and us because we depend on your common sense.

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)** A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:** not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):** Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News
Word of mouth



Respondent No: 777
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:49:50 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 778
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:51:45 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 779
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:56:31 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 780
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 10:58:41 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Jannie Lui

Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am: (check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 781
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:00:55 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 782
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:02:42 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 783
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:04:21 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gates | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 784
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:06:07 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 785
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:07:55 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 786
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:11:10 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. **Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42. **I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. **Please specify:**

not answered

Q44. **I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 787
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:12:53 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 788
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:14:54 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
Prefer 45%
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: No gate at all | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: Paul My e-mail is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 789
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:16:28 am
At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 790
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:18:21 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

not answered

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

Q44. I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News



Respondent No: 791
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:20:32 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: Christine

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 792
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:22:25 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|--|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is:

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**



Respondent No: 793
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:26:41 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** Yes
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** Option 3: Limit house depth to 50% of total lot depth
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** Yes
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** Option 3: Rear yard setback determined by % lot depth (25% lot depth)
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** Yes
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** Yes

| | |
|---|---|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 2: Allow one 0.6 m (2 ft.) projection, a maximum of 1.8 m (6 ft. in length on one side of the house only |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | Minimize ability to look into neighbours houses. Privacy issue. |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | Option 3: 40% coverage; total site coverage of 60%; 30% to 40% of lot to be live plantings |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | We need more green and trees will help. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | Option 3: Minimum of 60% of the required front yard setback be landscaped |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | Yes |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: We already have homes with sliding gates right on the property line. Traffic has to stop while resident waits for his gate to slide open. | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | Yes |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | Option 4: Maximum projection from front wall of house of 6.6 m (21.6 ft.) |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | Yes |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

We look forward to giving input on mega homes and particularly mega homes on Agricultural land. #3
Road and Steveston Highway is a terrible example. We are so angry. My name is: [REDACTED]
My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story



Respondent No: 794
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:28:51 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail address is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family Building Massing updates as I am:**
(check all that apply)

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 795
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:30:41 am

At:

- Q1. **I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q2. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)** not answered
- Q3. **Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House** not answered
- Q4. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q5. **I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.** No (retain status quo - Option 1)
- Q6. **If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)** not answered
- Q7. **Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q8. **Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback** not answered
- Q9. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q10. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m² (105 ft²) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.** No (retain status quo)
- Q11. **Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks** not answered
- Q12. **Comments:**
not answered
- Q13. **I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings.** No (retain status quo)

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q14.If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | not answered |
| Q15.Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16.Comments: | not answered |
| Q17.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q18.Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19.Comments | not answered |
| Q20.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q21.If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22.Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23.Comments: | not answered |
| Q24.I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |
| Q25.Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits | not answered |
| Q26.Comments: | not answered |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Q27. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q28. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below) | not answered |
| Q29. Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements | not answered |
| Q30. Comments: not answered | |
| Q31. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line. | No |
| Q32. Board 16 - Entry Gates | not answered |
| Q33. Comments: not answered | |
| Q34. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage. | No (retain status quo - Option 1) |
| Q35. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below) | not answered |
| Q36. Board 17 - Garage Projections | not answered |
| Q37. Comments: not answered | |
| Q38. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height. | No (retain status quo) |
| Q39. Board 18 - Measuring Building Height | not answered |
| Q40. Comments: not answered | |

Q41. Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:

My name is: My e-mail is:

**Q42. I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident
A Richmond builder/developer

Q43. Please specify:

not answered

**Q44. I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Word of mouth



Respondent No: 796
Login: Cathy S
Email: cswan@richmond.ca

Responded Mar 07, 2017 11:40:50 am

At:

Q1. I support an amendment to regulate the maximum depth of house.

Yes

Q2. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 2 below)

not answered

Q3. Board 2 - Maximum Depth of House

not answered

Q4. Comments:

Current regulations allow a 95' wall on a 160' lot. This results in a smaller house on a joining property losing all its view out that side. We look out our side windows, front windows and back windows and see a grey wall towering over us.

Q5. I support an amendment to change rear yard setbacks for a single family house.

Yes

Q6. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Boards 3 & 4 below)

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

Q7. Board 3 - Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q8. Board 4 - Minimum Rear Yard Setback

not answered

Q9. Comments:

not answered

Q10. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to update the rear yard and side yard setbacks for an accessory building greater than 10 m2 (105 ft2) in area, with a setback based on the size of the wall facing the neighbour.

Yes

Q11. Display Board 8 - Rear and Side Yard Setbacks

not answered

Q12. Comments:

Prefer Option 2

| | |
|---|---|
| Q13. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw regarding permitted projections into side yards for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q14. If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 9 below) | Option 3: Eliminate all side yard projections |
| Q15. Board 9 - Projections Allowed in Minimum Side Yard Setbacks | not answered |
| Q16. Comments: With the current 1.2 m setback to allow further projections is to add "insult to injury". 1.2 m is so close that construction activity has caused damage to our fence, lawn, sidewalk as there is so little space. | |
| Q17. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the location and setbacks of second storey rear decks for single family dwellings. | Yes |
| Q18. Board 11 - Location of Second Storey Decks Facing Rear & Side Yards | not answered |
| Q19. Comments Option 2 - Current regulations allow the new large house next door to look down into our yard. What about our privacy? | |
| Q20. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for site coverage limits and minimum landscaping requirements for single family dwellings. | not answered |
| Q21. If yes, my preferred option is: | not answered |
| Q22. Board 13 - Site Coverage and Landscaping | not answered |
| Q23. Comments: Option 2 or 3 | |
| Q24. I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum of two trees for each lot, for new single family houses where there are no pre-existing trees on the lot. | Yes |

Q25.**Board 14 - Tree Planting for New Single Family Building Permits** not answered

Q26.**Comments:**

Option 2

Q27.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to require a minimum area of front yard landscaping for single family dwellings.** not answered

Q28.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 15 below)** not answered

Q29.**Board 15 - Minimum Front Yard Landscaping Requirements** not answered

Q30.**Comments:**

Option 2 or 3

Q31.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to regulate front entry gates to a maximum height of 1.2 m (4 ft.) and a minimum setback of 6 m (20 ft.) from the front property line.** Yes

Q32.**Board 16 - Entry Gates** not answered

Q33.**Comments:**

Option 2

Q34.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to limit the forward projection of an attached garage.** Yes

Q35.**If yes, my preferred option is: (see Board 17 below)** not answered

Q36.**Board 17 - Garage Projections** not answered

Q37.**Comments:**

Option 3 or 4

Q38.**I support an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw for the measurement of building height.** Yes

Q40.**Comments:**

As roads are being built higher per Prov Regulation measuring from there allows greater height and puts existing houses even deeper in a hole. The measurement s/b made from the average of the adjacent yard elevations.

Q41.**Please use this space to provide any other comments you may have:**

My name is: [REDACTED] My e-mail is: [REDACTED]

Q42.**I am interested in the Single Family
Building Massing updates as I am:
(check all that apply)**

A Richmond resident

Q43.**Please specify:**

not answered

Q44.**I heard about this public consultation
process via (check all that apply):**

Newspaper story

Newspaper advertisement: Richmond News

LetsTalkRichmond.ca website

Facebook

Word of mouth