

RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500
SUMMARY OF KEY INPUT FROM A.I.B.C.* & RESPONSE OF CITY

	Input from A.I.B.C. (Architectural Institute of BC)*	Response by City Staff
1	The new Zoning Bylaw should implement the City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) and be synchronized with the Official Community Plan (OCP).	<i>Agreed – CCAP policies and guidelines are incorporated into a number of the proposed new Standard Zones. The new Zoning Bylaw is consistent with the OCP.</i>
2	Clarification to be provided as to why the City is replacing its existing Zoning Bylaw with a new Zoning Bylaw.	<i>A table entitled “Summary List of Key Issues Addressed” helps explain why the Bylaw is being updated.</i>
3	Question why the Interpretation section refers to parking when rounding up the calculation of density.	<i>Reference to parking has been deleted in this section.</i>
4	Specific comments were made on a number of the definitions (e.g., attic; balcony; bay window; building face; cantilevered roofs; coach house; floor area; building grade; gross floor area; finished site grade; natural grade; height; apartment housing; town housing; panhandle lot; lot area; lot coverage; usable open space; party wall; private outdoor open space; residential vertical depth & width envelope).	<i>Most of these comments were addressed and the definitions amended accordingly or in some cases deleted. Some comments were considered but changes were not made (e.g., crawl space) or clarity was provided elsewhere (e.g., floor area ratio (FAR) and gross versus net floor area were clarified in the General Development Regulations section).</i>
5	Request clarification or changes to the projections into the yards provisions (e.g., eaves; steps; entries; gutters; accessory structures). Also suggest that contradictions between different projections be corrected (e.g., balconies; porches).	<i>General Development Regulations section has been rewritten to provide for different projections for single detached housing, two-unit housing, town housing, low rise residential, mid to high rise residential and all other zones, as well as to resolve any contradictions.</i>
6	Concern regarding height and grade provisions (e.g., building grade).	<i>This has been deleted from the General Development Regulations.</i>
7	Question why the floor area exemption for basic universal housing features doesn't apply to townhouses with elevators.	<i>UDI agreed to limit this exemption to single storey townhouses. If a townhouse development proposes elevators, the calculation of density can be dealt with in a Site Specific Zone.</i>
8	Question inclusion of basic universal housing features in Zoning Bylaw. Suggest referencing the BC Building Code.	<i>UDI, Richmond Centre for Disability and City agreed to this approach, which shouldn't be changed at this time.</i>
9	Concern that the secondary suite provisions are restricted to single detached housing and that secondary suites are not permitted in multiple family residential developments.	<i>Staff will review the potential for secondary suites in the standard multiple-family residential (townhouse and apartment) zones as part of the OCP update. Secondary suites currently can be allowed in Site Specific Zones (i.e., former CD zones).</i>
10	Concern with landscaping requirements for open space.	<i>Has been removed because erroneously included.</i>
11	Various comments/questions on the Parking and Loading section (e.g., drive aisle and manoeuvring aisle; minimum parking and loading height; units of measure; loading and bicycle requirements; contradictions between sections; etc).	<i>Transportation staff recently updated this section. Where appropriate, changes have been made in response to A.I.B.C. comments. Items not changed in the Bylaw can be dealt with through the Development Permit process.</i>
12	General comments were made on building height, non-porous coverage and FAR calculations (e.g., building heights should be increased by about 0.3 m).	<i>Changes were not made to the proposed new bylaw due to the City's flood proofing and storm drainage objectives.</i>
13	Improve the bylaw from a formatting point of view.	<i>Done.</i>
14	Create a single family housing district for fee simple row housing with no side yard setback requirements.	<i>This will be examined when a rezoning application is received for this form of development.</i>
15	Suggest specific amendments to the standard town house zones (e.g., allow bed and breakfast as well as secondary suites as a use permitted; adjust the setbacks on some streets; increase the permitted FARs; allow bigger garages to be exempted from FAR).	<i>Some suggestions incorporated into the Standard Zones or General Development Regulations (e.g., increase in the permitted densities; standardize the setbacks and projections allowed). Some suggestions were deemed inappropriate (e.g., allow bed and breakfasts in townhouses and permit larger garages).</i>
16	Add a new apartment zone with an FAR of 1.6 and a lot coverage of 40%, as well as an FAR of 2.0 with a lot coverage of 50%.	<i>These densities and lot coverage have been added to the proposed zone that replaces the existing R4 zone in order to implement the proposed new CCAP.</i>
17	Increase the density and revise the setbacks and heights in the high density apartment zone.	<i>These changes have been made to the proposed zone that replaces the existing C7 zone in order to implement the proposed new CCAP.</i>
18	Check the non porous surface requirements proposed in the Commercial zones and the setback rationale for refuse or recycling bins adjacent to residential zones.	<i>Non porous requirements have been deleted in the Commercial zones and the rationale for the refuse or recycling bin setback has been simplified.</i>
19	Why limit religious assembly to one per lot in the Community Commercial zone?	<i>Want to retain commercial space and ensure religious assembly is not the principal use in a commercial area.</i>
20	Question the minimum lot sizes proposed in the Downtown Commercial zone.	<i>Minimum lot sizes are consistent with the CCAP (i.e., permit higher density on smaller lots).</i>

* Notes: Couple of architects who do work in Richmond attended a joint meeting with the Urban Development Institute (UDI) & Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association (GVHBA) and 1 architect has provided written comments twice.