

RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500
SUMMARY OF KEY INPUT FROM RICHMOND SMALL BUILDERS* & RESPONSE OF CITY

	Input from Richmond Small Builders*	Response by City Staff
1	Agree that the recent amendments to the R1/0.6 zone can be applied to the Coach House zone and the zones that replace the R1/A & R1/K zones where the garage has lane access.	<i>Done – proposed amendments to the Coach House zone and the RSI, 2, 3/A & K zones where the garage is accessed from the lane:</i> 1) <i>limit the additional density to ground-oriented porches that open to two (2) or more sides only;</i> 2) <i>reduce the lot coverage of non-porous area from 80% to 70%;</i> 3) <i>restrict the width of the connected room to a maximum 50% of the width of the principal building (up to 3.6 m) and the height to single storey;</i> 4) <i>clarify the rear yard setback requirements;</i> 5) <i>increase the height of the plane at the required front yard setback from 4.0 m to 5.0 m;</i> 6) <i>increase the building separation from 1.2 m to 3 m;</i> 7) <i>introduce new provisions on screening and landscaping;</i> 8) <i>require a small private outdoor space with a minimum area of 20 m² and a minimum depth and width of 3 m outside the front yard setback; and</i> 9) <i>restrict the width of the driveway between the lane and an attached garage to 6 m.</i>
2	Agree to reduce the lot coverage of non-porous area from 80% to 70% in all other R1 zones and to increase the amount of live landscaping.	<i>Done – proposed amendments:</i> 1) <i>reduce the lot coverage of non-porous area from 80% to 70% in all RSI, 2, 3 zones; and</i> 2) <i>increase amount of live landscaping from 20% to:</i> a) <i>30% in RSI, 2, 3/D, E, F, G & H zones;</i> b) <i>25% in RSI, 2, 3/B, C & J zones; and</i> c) <i>20% in RSI, 2, 3/A & K zones.</i>
3	Concerned that Comprehensive Development Districts (CDs) have different lot coverage requirements, secondary suite rules and no affordable housing requirements.	<i>The lot coverage requirements have been adjusted to be consistent throughout the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. The secondary suite rules are the same in all single detached zones. The affordable housing requirements (i.e., density bonus provisions) will be added in the unlikely event that a property is rezoned to a CD.</i>
4	Suggest raising the permitted density to 0.6 floor area ratio in all single detached zones as an incentive to this form of development.	<i>Discussed and agreed that this is a bigger policy issue that can be reviewed as part of the update of the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) over the next year(s).</i>
5	Concerned that the 1 year grand fathering is not sufficient time in Richmond and that the information explaining this is incorrect or confusing on the City's web site.	<i>Clarified that the 1 year grand fathering should be sufficient since the proposed new Zoning Bylaw does not substantially change the requirements involved in a building permit, business license, development permit or subdivision. The information on the City's web site has been updated.</i>
6	The existing practices regarding setback interpretation need to be stated in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.	<i>Agreed – included in the residential vertical lot width envelope definition.</i>
7	Recent amendment to the existing building height definition requires clarification.	<i>Staff can further address this issue with a Building Permit Bulletin as part the implementation of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.</i>
8	Residential vertical lot depth envelope doesn't work for gables on small, compact lots.	<i>Issue was addressed as part of the recent amendments to the R1/0.6 zone. Similar amendments are proposed to the Coach House zone and RSI, 2, 3/A & K zones.</i>
9	Request that staff visit some recently built single detached houses on large and medium sized lots.	<i>Staff have worked with the Richmond small builders to resolve their issues and will visit sites as appropriate.</i>
10	Extreme concern was expressed about the proposed house size limits in the Agricultural zones, particularly on small lots. Agree to the 50 m maximum setback and landscaping requirements.	<i>Staff have removed the proposed house size limits from the new Agriculture zones. This matter was discussed with the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and staff from the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) and Ministry of Agriculture & Lands.</i>

Note: * - The Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association (GVHBA) was also asked for input, attended some meetings but had no comments to make on the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.