



**To:** Planning Committee **Date:** September 28, 2009  
**From:** Brian J. Jackson, MCIP **File:** 12-8060-02-04/Vol 02  
 Director of Development  
**Re:** Proposed New Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500

**Staff Recommendation**

That Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 be introduced and given first reading.

Brian J. Jackson, MCIP  
 Director of Development  
 (604-276-4138)

Att.

FOR ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY			
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE		CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER
Business Licences .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Real Estate Services .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
City Clerk .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Community Bylaws .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Law .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Building Approvals .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Policy Planning .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
Parks Planning & Design .....	Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>REVIEWED BY TAG</b>	YES	NO	<b>REVIEWED BY CAO</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>MK</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>CD</i>
			<input type="checkbox"/>

## Staff Report

### Origin

#### Background

With Council's approval, City staff initiated an update and replacement of existing Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300, which was initially adopted in 1989. In order to assist with this task, Stantec Consulting Ltd. was retained.

The purpose of the review is to improve the City's zoning regulations, respond to the community's concerns regarding inconsistencies and lack of clarity, provide greater efficiencies, remove potential impediments to development and implement new policy initiatives recently adopted by Council.

It should be noted that the proposed new Zoning Bylaw is intended to implement the Official Community Plan (including Area and Sub-Area Plans) and other land use objectives of the City. As such, it is a regulatory bylaw, not a policy document.

In preparing the new Zoning Bylaw, City staff are not proposing to rezone existing properties, with the exception of certain City owned parks. Instead, the bylaw is simply an adjustment to the existing zoning - e.g., Single-Family Housing District (R1/E) becomes Single Detached (RS1/E).

#### Goals of Zoning Bylaw Review

According to the Terms of Reference given the consultant, the goals of this project are:

1. To ensure that the new Zoning Bylaw implements the City of Richmond Official Community Plan, Area Plans, Sub-Area Plans and Development Permit Guidelines.
2. To bring the Zoning Bylaw to modern standards and ensure that it reflects the current and anticipated needs of the City in relation to legislative authority, legal requirements and sound land use management.
3. To ensure the Bylaw is legally enforceable and consistent with the authorities established in the *Local Government Act*, *Community Charter* and other applicable legislation.
4. To integrate relevant sections of other Bylaws and guidelines into the new Zoning Bylaw.
5. To implement the City's vision, current values (e.g., improved customer service, certainty) and priorities (e.g., economic development).
6. To address the City's community planning and zoning administrative issues.
7. To reorganize the Zoning Bylaw to improve its effectiveness, user friendliness, clarity and ease of interpretation by staff, developers and the public.

#### Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is to introduce the proposed new Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 and to recommend that it be given first reading.

## Findings Of Fact

### Summary of Key Issues Considered in Revising the Zoning Bylaw

To complement the goals identified above, there are a number of issues that the new Zoning Bylaw addresses. What these issues are and how they are managed are elaborated in **Attachment 1** to this report. They include:

1. Move away from the use of site specific zones (CDs) by updating the standard zones (i.e., zones that aren't site specific or a CD) so that they can be used more frequently and by rewriting all the CDs to use the same definitions and format as the standard zones.
2. Implement the Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy by incorporating the density bonus provisions for affordable housing into the standard zones for rezoning applications.
3. Implement the new City Centre Area Plan (CCAP) by introducing the appropriate provisions into the standard zones so that they can be used in the City Centre.
4. Ensure that the standard and site specific zones in Steveston Village comply with the Steveston Village Conservation Study.
5. Resolve inconsistencies between the *Agricultural Land Commission Act/Regulations* and the Zoning Bylaw based on consultation with staff from the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) and Ministry of Agriculture and Lands (MAL) and review these with the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC).
6. Eliminate inconsistencies with the Business Licensing Bylaw/Regulations by making the appropriate changes to the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.
7. Address inconsistencies between different zones by standardizing the terminology and provisions throughout the entire Bylaw.
8. Reduce the complexity and different interpretations of the existing bylaw by standardizing the calculation of density and projections permitted so that they apply to all zones.
9. Better manage the location and the shortage of appropriately zoned lands for religious assemblies by permitting this use in certain other standard zones subject to specific size limitations.
10. Address the parking of commercial vehicles by not permitting this in residential areas and by regulating it in agricultural areas as per the ALC policies.
11. Establish the means to permit bed and breakfasts (B&B) by adding B&B as a secondary use that can be permitted through the rezoning process subject to specific use regulations.
12. Reduce the amount of storm drainage and improve the landscaping associated with new residential buildings through the introduction of new porosity requirements to the extent that can be agreed to by Richmond builders.
13. Consider limiting the size of houses in agricultural areas in order to preserve as much farmland as possible (this is discussed further in the Analysis section).
14. Strengthen the prohibition of secondary suites or illegal dwelling units in accessory buildings in agricultural areas by introducing a 1½ storey height limit for accessory buildings, a maximum building separation space of 50 m from the principal dwelling unit and restrictions on the washroom size, pedestrian access and location of a kitchen or any habitable space in the accessory building.

15. Reduce the encroachment of accessory residential buildings/structures into productive farmland by requiring that these be located within 50 m of a road and the single detached house.
16. Partially respond to a Council referral on telecommunication antenna by better managing the legal and jurisdictional issues in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (a separate staff report and siting protocol/consultation process will more fully respond to Council's referral).
17. Clarify how wind turbines should be managed in the Zoning Bylaw by permitting them as an accessory structure subject to the applicable height restrictions.

It should be noted that this is not a comprehensive list of all the issues addressed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. Additional items are expanded upon in other sections of this report (and the above-noted issues are not discussed again elsewhere in this report unless necessary).

Many of these issues arise from the fact that the existing Zoning & Development Bylaw No. 5300 was originally adopted in 1989. Although there have been numerous amendments to Bylaw No. 5300 over the years, this is the first comprehensive review in 20 years. However, it should be emphasized that this replacement is not a major overhaul of the City's existing zoning, but rather responds to specific Council directions as well as the concerns of the community.

#### Summary of Key Changes

There are a number of other key changes proposed in the new Zoning Bylaw 8500 that are not included in the issues noted above. For ease of reference, these changes are divided into new items, modifications/adjustments and those that reduce the use of CDs.

#### *New Items*

Some of the other key new items in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw include:

1. Every permitted use is now defined and a variety of other uses and terms have definitions in order to provide greater clarity and certainty.
2. These newly defined permitted uses are allowed in the appropriate zones based on the existing zoning and/or their existing location in that zone.
3. New sections have been added that define uses that are not permitted in any zone (e.g., abattoir, cemetery, manufactured home park or sales/rental) and that permit certain uses in all zones (e.g., agriculture, parks, telecommunication antenna, wind turbines, urban services, etc.).
4. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR), lot coverage and height are added to the few standard zones that currently do not have these in order to provide consistency and compliance with City plans or existing experience.
5. A Table of Equivalencies is used to determine how existing zones and in-stream rezoning applications will be managed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (i.e., zones will automatically be converted to the equivalent new zone).
6. In consultation with the Parks & Recreation Department, certain City owned parks are proposed to be rezoned (i.e., Garden City Park; Paulik Park; Katsura Park; Birch Park; and portions of King George Park and the park in the Alexandra Neighbourhood which are being rezoned from single-family housing to school and institutional use).

7. The Administration section includes new sections which address Previous Bylaws, Contracts & Agreements and Compliance with Other Regulations for clarity purposes.
8. It has been clarified that an incomplete rezoning application without the required information will generally not be forwarded to Council.
9. Air space parcels and phased strata lots are exempted from complying with the subdivision requirements to avoid problems for the City's Approving Officer when approving these developments.
10. It has been clarified that existing lots that are reduced in size because of the City's land dedication requirements are not non-conforming so as not to penalize the property owner.
11. Travel trailers and boats in residential zones are required to be screened from the public road and adjacent sites if not located in a driveway in order to avoid neighbourhood complaints.
12. Provision is made that open surface parking spaces should not be located in a yard or setback visible from the road (e.g., without appropriate landscaping or screening) and that the Director of Transportation can determine the parking, loading and bicycle requirements if they are not specifically identified in the Bylaw.
13. There is a new section to ensure that accessory buildings and accessory structures remain accessory to the principal permitted use, are not used as a dwelling unit and meet other conditions to regulate this form of development.

#### *Modifications/Adjustments*

The following are some of the modifications/adjustments that are made in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw from the existing Zoning & Development Bylaw:

1. Minor community care facilities (i.e., group home and child care up to 10 persons) continue to be permitted in all the same zones but in a more open and transparent manner.
2. Child care facilities over 10 persons are also more openly permitted wherever "community use" was previously permitted and are allowed in all the townhouse zones.
3. "Commercial use" in the existing Zoning & Development Bylaw is replaced with more precisely defined permitted uses.
4. Single detached housing is no longer permitted in certain townhouse or apartment zones where this use does not currently occur.
5. Car washes in gas and service station zones must be in an enclosed building and are subject to the noise provisions of the City's Health Bylaw to alleviate neighbouring complaints.
6. Residential security/operator units are more freely permitted in various zones to recognize the need for this type of protection and accommodation, and are also allowed to have a home business in the non-industrial zones.
7. Accessory structure heights are reduced in a number of zones to be the same as the principal building height and facilitate the appropriate siting of telecommunication antenna.
8. Aircraft noise report requirements are added to General Development Regulations so as to apply to all development permit applications subject to the OCP aircraft noise policies.
9. Existing standard zones have been consolidated into fewer new standard zones in a few instances, but distinguish between the zones on the zoning maps (e.g., Steveston Commercial zone).

10. The Administration section is expanded to clarify the Purpose of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw, Non-conformity and Enforcement staff/penalties.
11. The inclusion of the City as a potential applicant and reference to the wide variety of information that the City currently often requires with rezoning applications at the applicant's cost.
12. The existing lot size policy (702) sections and process are simplified or clarified to reflect the City's current practices.
13. Minimum lot size requirements are moved into each zone rather than being in a separate Subdivision section.
14. Greater clarity is provided on how zoning boundaries are determined on the zoning maps and are amended slightly to reflect the current high water mark and/or existing lot lines along the waterfront.
15. Secondary suite regulations are expanded and clarified (e.g., a secondary suite is not permitted where a site is rezoned for a new bed and breakfast involving more than 2 guests).
16. Updated landscaping and screening provisions have been added to reflect current City practices, Council policies and good design principles.
17. Parking and loading requirements have been adjusted by Transportation staff to respond to development trends (e.g., smaller minimum parking dimension for some residential uses, increase number of small car parking spaces permitted, etc.).
18. The flood plain designation and protection bylaw is reflected in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (e.g., modified finished site grade map).

#### *Reduce Use of CDs*

There are a few ways in which the proposed new Zoning Bylaw reduces the need to use site specific zones (CDs). These include:

1. Many of the provisions of the new City Centre Area Plan have been incorporated into the standard zones so that they are ready to be used with future rezoning applications (e.g., the density bonus provisions around the Village Centres are included as a "shelf ready" sub-zone).
2. Two new townhouse zones (high density townhouses and parking structure townhouses) and one new high density low rise apartment zone (e.g., for 6 storey wood frame construction) have been drafted and included in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw as "shelf ready" zones (i.e., these zones don't have a site zoned for this purpose yet).
3. Sub-zones will be used in the four categories of townhouse zones and three types of low rise apartment zones to avoid the need to create new CDs for these types of developments (there are already 69 townhouse CDs and 24 low rise apartment CDs from which to draw experience).
4. Comprehensive Development District (CD/28) is converted to a standard Infill Residential zone with a density bonus for affordable housing since it is often used in the City Centre.
5. Common setbacks are incorporated into the standard zones and frequently permitted projections are allowed in the General Development Regulations so that a new site specific zone (CD) doesn't have to be created for each of these variations.

6. The Zoning Bylaw recognizes that these setbacks and projections can be varied by a Development Permit/Development Variance Permit and that the OCP (including any applicable Area Plans or Sub-Area Plans) can have greater or lesser requirements.
7. City staff redrafted and categorized all of the existing CDs that have been adopted and those that are in-stream (e.g., at first, second or third reading) to ensure that the entire proposed new Zoning Bylaw uses a consistent terminology/format and to make it easier to distinguish between the +/- 200 site specific zones (CDs).
8. Staff will be recommending that the standard zones be used more often (rather than CDs) and will be directing rezoning applicants towards these standard zones.

It should be noted that site specific zones (CDs) will continue to be used where needed (e.g., complex/unique rezoning applications such as the proposed development at Fantasy Gardens), but this should occur less frequently.

## **Analysis**

### Effect

The intent of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw is to improve the City's zoning regulations while not having a major negative affect on existing properties or land uses. The following section analyzes the effect that the new Bylaw would have on seven different examples. It does not repeat items already noted in this staff report.

### Single and Two Family Lots

Two of the changes that representatives from the small builders in Richmond agreed to with respect to single family residential development are to:

- Incorporate the recent amendments that Council adopted regarding the size and development on compact lots to apply to rezoning applications on narrow lots with lane access and coach houses in order to provide consistency and to respond to neighbourhood concerns.
- Decrease the amount of lot coverage occupied by buildings, structures and non-porous surfaces from 80% to 70% in all single detached standard and site specific zones, and to increase the amount of live landscaping from 20% to 25%-30% in the zoning for medium and large sized lots.

The only other substantive change to the single and two family residential areas of Richmond as a result of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw is that garage sales are limited in order to prevent the outdoor storage or display of garage sale items for an extensive period of time.

### Townhouse Developments

Existing townhouse zoned sites will not be impacted by the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. Developers wanting to rezone a site for townhouse development will:

- Find the standard townhouse zones with a density bonus for affordable housing ready for their use with a maximum FAR of 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 1.0, 1.1 or 1.2.
- Continue to use the existing site specific zones (CDs) in the Alexandra Neighbourhood because the West Cambie Area Plan has a unique density bonus approach and interim amenity guidelines for affordable housing.

- Be able to include home-based businesses in their development if rezoning to a high density or parking structure townhouse zone in the City Centre as per the new CCAP.
- Require a certain lot width and/or lot area in accordance with the OCP's arterial road policies and the new CCAP.

#### Apartment Proposals

For the purposes of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw, a distinction has been made between low rise apartments and high rise apartments. The latter are described in the next section on Commercial and Mixed Use Developments because that is what most high rise apartments tend to be (although this is not always the case).

Existing low rise apartments are not really affected by the new Bylaw. However, if an existing low rise apartment zoned site were to come in for rezoning, or if an application was received to rezone a new site for low rise apartments:

- The density bonus provisions for affordable housing would apply and the applicant would be permitted a maximum FAR of 1.2, 1.5, 1.75 or 2.0, which are the usual thresholds for this form of development.
- Additional building height would be permitted to accommodate the increase in density, particularly in the City Centre as per the new CCAP.
- The existing site specific zones (CDs) would continue to be used in the Alexandra Neighbourhood because the West Cambie Area Plan has its own density bonus approach and interim amenity guidelines for affordable housing.
- Reduced setbacks are permitted in the medium and high density low rise apartment zones based on the CCAP and experience of recently approved developments.
- A certain lot width, lot depth and lot area would be required in accordance with the new CCAP in order to ensure that the property is an adequate development site.

#### Commercial and Mixed Use Developments

The proposed new Zoning Bylaw will have the following affect on existing and proposed sites zoned for commercial and mixed use development:

- The range of permitted uses is expanded or clarified based on the new definitions in the Bylaw and/or the existing land uses in these zones.
- Home-based businesses and live/work dwellings will be permitted in the City Centre as envisioned in the new CCAP.
- Limitations are placed on the location of the new residential uses in certain zones in order to retain a commercial presence on the ground floor on pedestrian-oriented streets in the City Centre.
- The minimum road setback has been lowered in certain zones in order to encourage commercial development closer to the road provided that there is an adequate transition with adjacent developments.
- The minimum road setback has been raised in other zones with the potential to be lowered provided that there is a proper interface at the sidewalk level and no driveways or loading areas are located along the road.



- The downtown commercial and residential/limited commercial zones contain sub-zones that can be used to implement the new CCAP (e.g., have the density bonus provisions, maximum lot coverage, building heights and minimum lot width/depth/area requirements that could be used for future rezoning applications in the City Centre).
- The marina zones reference the Fraser River Estuary Management Program (FREMP) and City's Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) Development Permit Guidelines/Policies.

#### Industrial Properties

Once again, other than including a wide range of newly defined industrial uses that are currently permitted in the existing industrial zones and being written so as to be able to be used to implement the new CCAP, the proposed new industrial zones will not affect industrial properties in any significant way. The only other impact the proposed new Bylaw would have on industrial properties is:

- To permit commercial education in the industrial business park zone.
- To encourage telecommunication antenna to locate in the industrial zones by permitting a greater accessory structure height.
- The introduction of maximum FAR, lot coverage and height regulations in zones that currently do not have these so as to be consistent with the other industrial zones and to better regulate all forms of industrial development.
- Permitting additional floor area if it is used for community amenity space.

#### Institutional Land Uses

The proposed new Zoning Bylaw does not intend to affect the various institutional land uses in the City. However, some items are worth noting:

- The range of uses permitted in the school and institutional use zone has been refined and each has been specifically defined (whereas few of the permitted uses in the existing SPU zone have definitions).
- No distinction can legally be made between a "private" and "public" school, therefore education (kindergarten to grade 12) is permitted in both the proposed new school and institutional use (SI) zone and the assembly (ASY) zone.
- A requirement has been added that landscaping and screening should provide site lines from windows and doors as well as natural surveillance to walkways, parking areas, loading, storage, refuse and recycling for security purposes.
- Commercial uses are permitted in a park if approved by the City to accommodate events like the 2010 Olympics or those sponsored by a community centre association.

#### Agricultural Lands

Various changes were made to the zones governing agricultural lands in Richmond. These have either already been noted in this report or are discussed below in the consultation section. In essence, the affect of these changes would be to:

- Eliminate any contradiction between the City's Zoning Bylaw and the ALR legislation, regulations and policies, which should facilitate enforcement matters.

- Use the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands provincial standards where appropriate so that Richmond's zoning is consistent with good farming practices found throughout B.C. and in other municipalities (e.g., raise the maximum floor area ratio for greenhouses in the agricultural zone from 0.60 to 0.75).
- Protect the farmland by requiring all houses and accessory buildings or structures such as a garage, carport, septic field, swimming pool, tennis court, etc. to be located within 50 m of the adjacent public road.

Based on feedback from the public and representatives of the Richmond small builders, staff abandoned a proposal to limit the size of houses in agricultural areas. This item was also discussed with the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and there appeared to be no clear consensus to pursue house size limits at this time. Staff are not proposing to pursue this matter any further unless directed by a Council referral. Limiting the size of houses in agricultural areas can be controversial and warrants a separate public consultation process apart from this proposed new Zoning Bylaw.

## **Consultation**

### Process

Three of the most recent drafts of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw have been made available for input from the development community, professional associations and general public. A copy of the proposed new Bylaw in its various iterations has been posted on the City's web site for the past 12 months.

As much as possible, City staff has tried to involve people and groups outside of City Hall in the review and replacement of the Zoning Bylaw. As can be appreciated, such input can be difficult to obtain (unless a controversial proposal is involved) since the Bylaw is a rather large, legal document of a technical nature.

### Input from the Urban Development Institute (UDI)

UDI staff and representatives from the UDI Liaison Committee to Richmond were invited to provide their input on each of the drafts of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. Included as **Attachment 2** is a summary of the key input from UDI and the response of City staff.

It is staff's impression that UDI is satisfied with their involvement in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw and have no further comments to make. A copy of the latest version of the new Bylaw has been made available to UDI staff and they have been advised that this staff report will be bringing Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 forward for Council consideration in the fall.

### Input from Richmond Small Builders and Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association (GVHBA)

The GVHBA was asked for input and circulated a copy of the bylaw link to their members. However, the City didn't receive any comments from the GVHBA on the proposed new Bylaw.

Since many of the small builders in Richmond are not part of the GVHBA, City staff met twice with some representatives from this group. **Attachment 3** summarizes the key input from the Richmond small builders and the response by City staff.

Generally speaking, it is staff's understanding that there are no outstanding concerns regarding the proposed new zones that permit single detached housing.

### Input from the Architectural Institute of British Columbia (AIBC)

The AIBC was also invited to provide their professional input into the each of the earlier drafts of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. A couple of architects who do work in Richmond attended a joint meeting that was held for UDI and the GVHBA. One architect has provided written comments twice on the proposed new bylaw.

**Attachment 4** is a summary of the key input from AIBC and how City staff have responded. Although not all items were agreed to, it is believed that the input from the AIBC has led to a better bylaw. Items that require further discussion or which involved differing opinions can always be addressed in subsequent rezoning applications or housekeeping amendments.

### Input from the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and Staff from the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) and Ministry of Agriculture & Lands (MAL)

The AAC went over the proposed new Zoning Bylaw at two separate meetings. City staff also spent considerable time conversing with the staff representatives to the AAC from the ALC and MAL. This input was very productive and led to a number of changes to the proposed new Bylaw that improved the agricultural definitions and provisions.

**Attachment 5** provides a summary of this input and the response of the City. A copy of this attachment has been given to the AAC and staff from the ALC and MAL. As far as the City is aware, this committee and these staff are satisfied with the outcome.

### Input from In-Stream Comprehensive Development (CD) Rezoning Applicants

There are 18 proposed new CDs that are in various stages of being in-stream (i.e., at first reading or third reading but not yet adopted). These rezoning applications will continue to be processed and, if adoption of any of these applications occurs after Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is adopted, such amendments will be deemed to be applications to amend Bylaw 8500. As such, City staff have rewritten each of the 18 proposed new CDs into new site specific zones in progress using the same format and definitions used in the rest of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. All of the rezoning applicants have been consulted with regard to the proposed new site specific zones to ensure that they are properly drafted to meet their development objectives.

### Input from Richmond School District (SD) No. 38

Although not required to consult with the School District (SD), staff have discussed the relevant sections of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw with staff of the Richmond School District. SD staff are reviewing the proposed changes to the school and institutional use zone and will advise the City of their comments or those of the Board of Education (if deemed necessary).

It is not expected that the SD will have any major comments or concerns that cannot be addressed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. In fact, when the SD is looking at the sale of surplus sites, it will now be able to market these sites for private schools with kindergarten to Grade 12, whereas up until now this has not been the case. This change has been made based on case law which has determined that municipalities can not distinguish between public and private uses such as schools in a zoning bylaw. This could prove to be quite advantageous to the SD and has been favourably received at the staff level.

### Summary Of Key Input From Public

A public open house was held on the proposed new Zoning Bylaw in late 2008. At this open house, copies of the first, complete draft of the proposed new Bylaw were made available. The public open house was sparsely attended, not because of a lack of advertising but, because of its technical nature, this is not a item that tends to attract the attention of the public.

Nonetheless, City staff have fielded various inquiries about the proposed new Zoning Bylaw based on its posting on the City's website over the past 12 months and by word of mouth that this review was underway. Most of the inquiries involved an earlier proposal to limit the size of houses in the agricultural zones (which has since been abandoned because of the public concerns expressed) and the potential legalization of bed and breakfasts.

At this point in time, staff are not aware of any public concerns regarding the proposed new Zoning Bylaw and do not believe that further public consultation would solicit any more interest than has already been expressed.

### **Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact to the City in adopting Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500.

### **Conclusion**

City staff, Stantec Consulting Ltd. and our lawyers have been working on a proposed new Zoning Bylaw that would replace the existing Zoning & Development Bylaw that was adopted in 1989.

This report has summarized the goals of this project, identified the key issues being addressed, summarized the major changes being proposed and described the affect the proposed new Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 would have on a variety of different land uses.

City staff have consulted with the UDI, GVHBA, Richmond small builders, AIBC, AAC, ALC, MAL, public, in-stream rezoning applicants with pending CDs and with SD staff. It is believed that a general consensus has been reached that warrants proceeding with first reading of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.

Should last minute concerns arise at Planning Committee, Council or the Public Hearing, these could be addressed by subsequent housekeeping amendments to Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500. Staff envision there may be a need to bring forward further amendments to the proposed new Zoning Bylaw over the next year or two. This occurs in most municipalities which adopt a new zoning bylaw. The reason for this is that such a large, legal document may miss some items or inadvertently have unintended implications.

If Council decides to proceed with Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, staff in Policy Planning and Development Applications (in consultation with other Divisions) will identify what amendments are required to other City bylaws. Specific attention will be given to any bylaws that may require immediate attention that can be amended easily without triggering a major review of that bylaw (e.g., updating the zoning references in the Sign Bylaw).

In-stream rezoning applications that have received first or third reading will be adopted using the new zones contained in Bylaw 8500. However, should a rezoning applicant want their application to be processed under the existing Zoning & Development Bylaw, they would have 1 year from the date Bylaw 8500 is adopted to obtain the necessary building permit, business license, development permit or subdivision (whichever is applicable to their development).

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H. Burke". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Holger Burke, MCIP  
Development Coordinator  
(604-276-4164)  
HB:cas

**RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500**  
**SUMMARY LIST OF KEY ISSUES ADDRESSED\***

	<b>Issue with Existing Bylaw*</b>	<b>Response in Proposed New Bylaw</b>
1	Try to move away from the use of Comprehensive Development Districts (CDs). Note: CDs will continue to be used where needed.	<i>Incorporate changes in the proposed new Standard Zones so that they can be used more frequently (e.g., to implement the proposed new City Centre Area Plan).</i>
2	Implement the Richmond Affordable Housing Strategy (AHS) that was adopted by Council in May 2007.	<i>Incorporate the density bonus provisions envisioned by the AHS into a number of the proposed Standard Zones (i.e., for secondary suites, affordable housing units or contributions to the affordable housing reserve).</i>
3	Implement the provisions of the proposed new City Centre Area Plan (CCAP).	<i>Incorporate the land uses, densities, density bonus options, lot coverage, setbacks, heights and minimum lot sizes envisioned in the CCAP into a number of the proposed Standard Zones.</i>
4	Ensure the Steveston Village Conservation Study is incorporated into the new Zoning Bylaw.	<i>Amendments have been made to the zones in the Steveston area to implement this study.</i>
5	Resolve inconsistencies between the Zoning Bylaw and the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).	<i>Permitted uses in the proposed new Agriculture zone and their definitions are consistent with the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) Act and Regulations.</i>
6	Eliminate inconsistencies between the Business Licensing Bylaw/Regulations and the Zoning Bylaw.	<i>Appropriate changes have been made to the proposed new Zoning Bylaw to be consistent with the existing Business Licensing Bylaw/Regulations (e.g., clarification of the home business provisions; minimum lot sizes for business licenses permitted in the proposed new Agriculture zone).</i>
7	Address inconsistencies between different zones.	<i>Standardize the terminology and provisions throughout the bylaw (e.g., consistency between the proposed new Standard Zones and Site Specific Zones). Define all permitted uses.</i>
8	Reduce the complexity and different interpretations in the existing bylaw.	<i>Standardize the calculation of density and projections permitted into yards and incorporate them into the General Development Regulations section.</i>
9	Deal with the location of religious assemblies and shortage of appropriately zoned lands for this use.	<i>Add religious assembly as a permitted use subject to certain size limitations in the proposed new zones that replace the existing Community Commercial District (C3) and Automobile-Oriented Commercial District (C6) zones.</i>
10	Address the parking of commercial vehicles in residential and agricultural areas.	<i>Definition of commercial vehicles has been added. Commercial vehicle parking or storage is specifically not permitted in all residential zones and is regulated in the ALR.</i>
11	Establish the means to legally permit bed and breakfasts in the Zoning Bylaw.	<i>Bed and breakfast added as an additional secondary use which can be permitted through the rezoning process in the proposed new zones that replace the existing Single-Family Housing District (R1/A-H, J-K) and Agricultural District (AG1).</i>
12	Reduce the amount of storm drainage and improve the landscaping associated with new buildings.	<i>Introduce new porosity requirements in the proposed zones that permit residential development.</i>
13	Consider limiting the size of houses in agricultural areas in order to preserve as much farmland as possible.	<i>This was considered but later abandoned. The existing 50 m maximum setback and proposed lot coverage/maximum floor area ratio regulations will help regulate the location and size of buildings in the proposed new zone that replaces the existing Agricultural District (AG1) zone.</i>
14	Prevent the use of accessory buildings in agricultural areas for secondary suites or illegal dwelling units.	<i>Implement height, location and use limitations to accessory buildings in the proposed new zone that replaces the existing Agricultural (AG1) zone.</i>
15	Reduce the encroachment of accessory residential buildings and structures into productive farmland.	<i>Clarify and expand upon the 50 m setback requirement from a public road in the proposed new zone that replaces the existing Agricultural (AG1) zone.</i>
16	Respond to the Council referral to deal with communication towers in agricultural and other areas.	<i>Permit telecommunication antenna in all zones in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw subject to appropriate accessory structure height limits and ALR restrictions.</i>
17	Examine how to address wind turbines in the Zoning Bylaw.	<i>Wind turbines are permitted as an accessory structure subject to the applicable accessory structure height restrictions.</i>

\* Note: These are issues identified by the City that need to be addressed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. The list is not comprehensive and does not identify all of the items addressed in the review of the existing Zoning Bylaw.

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

	<b>Input from UDI (Urban Development Institute)</b>	<b>Response by City Staff</b>
1	Concern that uses permitted in the existing bylaw may not be permitted in the new Zoning Bylaw due to the new definitions (e.g., food catering establishment; assembly).	<i>This is not the intent. Lists have been prepared of the permitted uses &amp; definitions to clarify and track changes between the existing and proposed new Zoning Bylaw.</i>
2	Concern that uses that are permitted outright now are proposed to be secondary (accessory) uses in the new bylaw (e.g., office in the zone at Riverport).	<i>This concern has been addressed and the approach was changed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (e.g., office is a permitted use in the zone at Riverport).</i>
3	Concern that new regulations are being inserted into the zoning districts where none previously existed (e.g., minimum lot areas; minimum heights; new setbacks). UDI requested that these new regulations be specifically identified.	<i>Many of the proposed new regulations have been deleted unless deemed necessary or consistent with the policies of the proposed new City Centre Area Plan (CCAP). A table entitled "Summary List of Key Issues Addressed" identifies some of the new regulations proposed.</i>
4	Specific concern was expressed as to how the proposed new Zoning Bylaw would affect liquor primary uses.	<i>The intent is not to change how the City handles liquor primary uses.</i>
5	Suggest that the new Zoning Bylaw accommodate the changes to the B.C. Building Code to permit 6 storey wood frame construction.	<i>The existing R4 zone is proposed to be supplemented with provisions that would accommodate 6 storey wood frame construction and implement the proposed new CCAP.</i>
6	Don't limit residential sales centers to a 1 year time frame.	<i>This limitation is removed from the proposed new bylaw.</i>
7	Request confirmation that the existing rules/processes are not changing for rezoning applications (e.g., Public Hearing notification; signage requirements; resubmission regulations if a rezoning application is denied by Council).	<i>Confirm that there are no changes to the rules/processes in the Zoning Bylaw (City Clerks is proposing a change to the Council Procedure Bylaw that would limit the speaking time for applicants and the public to 5 minutes at a Public Hearing).</i>
8	Bedroom definition refers to the requirement for a window, which is no longer required by the B.C. Building Code.	<i>Definition has been amended as requested.</i>
9	Considerable discussion with regard to the difference between gross versus net floor area ratio (FAR), particularly as it relates to the affordable housing requirements.	<i>In accordance with the Affordable Housing Strategy adopted by Council in May 2007, the proposed new Zoning Bylaw implements the density bonusing approach and uses the floor area ratio (excluding any permitted exemptions) as the basis for the contribution of money or building area for affordable housing.</i>
10	Suggestion that FAR calculations take into account "green/sustainable construction" (e.g., larger electrical/service areas for geo-thermal or other green infrastructure).	<i>Provision has been made for a larger electrical/service area to be excluded from the FAR calculations where certified to be appropriate by a professional engineer.</i>
11	Agricultural zoning should be in compliance with the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) regulations, and uses that require ALC approval should be noted.	<i>These zones were reviewed by the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and staff from the ALC and Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Lands, and amended accordingly.</i>
12	Request that the Industrial zones be reviewed with respect to the maximum density and lot coverage to ensure that these zones allow for the intensive use of sites.	<i>Industrial zones incorporate the additional density, lot coverage and heights permitted in the City Centre as part of the proposed new CCAP.</i>
13	Specific comments were made on the parking and loading provisions (e.g., self storage needs its own parking requirement; congregate care parking regulation is too high, as is golf course/driving range; review loading requirements to ensure that they don't result in a larger parkade).	<i>These parking and loading requirements were reviewed and amended.</i>
14	Consider that geothermal heating requires more service area between floors that could increase building height.	<i>Additional building height for geothermal heating can be permitted through the development permit process.</i>
15	The zoning maps have not been included so it is not possible to verify whether zone descriptions, densities, etc. have changed.	<i>The zoning maps will be prepared and made available with the final, official version of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.</i>
16	Definition of private club does not include gathering of persons for educational purposes.	<i>Added to definition.</i>
17	Commercial education does not include universities and colleges.	<i>Correct. University education is defined and allowed in certain zones (not including the zone at Riverport).</i>
18	The new entertainment, spectator and amusement center definitions are more limited than the current commercial entertainment definition.	<i>This isn't the intent. Greater clarity is provided what is permitted as commercial entertainment (e.g., liquor primary establishment is added to the zone at Riverport).</i>
19	Office definition excludes government services and other office uses related to on-site sales or the manufacture and handling of products.	<i>Office definition amended to not exclude government services. Offices would continue to be permitted as an ancillary use to retail sales in the Commercial zones and to manufacturing in the Industrial zones.</i>
20	The permitted density in the zone at Riverport excludes off-street parking from the calculation of floor area ratio.	<i>This is covered in the General Development Regulations as it applies universally to all zones.</i>

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

	<b>Input from Richmond Small Builders*</b>	<b>Response by City Staff</b>
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.	<p><i>Done – proposed amendments to the Coach House zone and the RS1, 2, 3/A &amp; K zones where the garage is accessed from the lane:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>limit the additional density to ground-oriented porches that open to two (2) or more sides only;</i></li> <li>2) <i>reduce the lot coverage of non-porous area from 80% to 70%;</i></li> <li>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></li> <li>4) <i>clarify the rear yard setback requirements;</i></li> <li>5) <i>increase the height of the plane at the required front yard setback from 4.0 m to 5.0 m;</i></li> <li>6) <i>increase the building separation from 1.2 m to 3 m;</i></li> <li>7) <i>introduce new provisions on screening and landscaping;</i></li> <li>8) <i>require a small private outdoor space with a minimum area of 20 m<sup>2</sup> and a minimum depth and width of 3 m outside the front yard setback; and</i></li> <li>9) <i>restrict the width of the driveway between the lane and an attached garage to 6 m.</i></li> </ol>
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.	<p><i>Done – proposed amendments:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>reduce the lot coverage of non-porous area from 80% to 70% in all RS1, 2, 3 zones; and</i></li> <li>2) <i>increase amount of live landscaping from 20% to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>30% in RS1, 2, 3/D, E, F, G &amp; H zones;</i></li> <li>b) <i>25% in RS1, 2, 3/B, C &amp; J zones; and</i></li> <li>c) <i>20% in RS1, 2, 3/A &amp; K zones.</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>
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 the 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 RS1, 2, 3/A &amp; 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 &amp; 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.



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

	<b>Input from A.I.B.C. (Architectural Institute of BC)*</b>	<b>Response by City Staff</b>
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.

**RICHMOND ZONING BYLAW 8500**  
**SUMMARY OF KEY INPUT FROM AAC AND STAFF FROM ALC AND MAL & RESPONSE OF CITY**

	<b>Input from AAC (Agricultural Advisory Committee) and Staff from ALC (Agricultural Land Commission) and MAL (Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Lands)</b>	<b>Response by City Staff</b>
1	Comments were received from MAL staff regarding the definitions of different types of agriculture, farm-based winery, roadside stand and agricultural structures. Staff from the ALC agreed with these comments and the response by City staff. The AAC was made aware of the suggested changes to the proposed new Zoning Bylaw and expressed no concerns or objections.	<i>A new definition entitled farm business is used in the agriculture, golf course and applicable site specific zones, which is consistent with the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act and Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) Act and Regulations. Agri-tourist operation is defined and the definitions of farm-based winery, roadside stand and agricultural structures are amended to be consistent with the ALC Regulations.</i>
2	MAL staff asked that residential sales centers not be permitted in the agriculture and golf course zones. ALC staff and AAC agreed.	<i>Clarified that a residential sales center would not be permitted in these zones or any site specific zones that permit farm business.</i>
3	MAL staff requested landscaping not be required abutting a ditch in agricultural areas. ALC staff and AAC agreed.	<i>The proposed landscaping and screening section makes the exemption requested by MAL staff.</i>
4	Comments from MAL staff on the parking requirements for the agriculture and golf course zones (e.g., parking visible from a public road; curbs in parking areas; parking for farm-based winery, roadside stand and agri-tourist operation/accommodation.).	<i>All of these items were addressed in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw, and were reviewed by ALC staff and the AAC – both of whom concurred to the changes made by City staff in response to the MAL staff comments.</i>
5	MAL staff suggest a limitation on the parking of non-farm commercial vehicles in the agricultural zones. ALC staff gave the City its policy regarding commercial vehicles in the ALR. The AAC expressed no concerns or objections to the City's response.	<i>The ALC's policy regarding commercial vehicles was incorporated into the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (i.e., the commercial vehicles and equipment must be owned or operated by the owner or occupier of the land or by the immediate family).</i>
6	MAL/ALC staff and the AAC expressed concern regarding the on-site loading space requirements if they applied to a farm business.	<i>City staff amended the zoning requirements for on-site loading spaces so that they do not apply to a farm business.</i>
7	MAL and ALC staff requested that the uses permitted in the agriculture and golf course zones be consistent with the ALC Act and Regulations.	<i>Done. The agriculture and golf course zones were reviewed by the AAC and no concerns were expressed regarding the revised permitted or secondary use sections.</i>
8	The AAC and staff from the ALC and MAL reviewed the proposal to introduce house size limits in the ALR. No clear consensus was received to pursue this matter now.	<i>City staff have heard a lot of opposition to the house size limits proposal and have decided to drop it at this time (unless Council directs staff to review this matter further).</i>
9	The AAC and staff from the MAL and ALC reviewed the number of dwelling units currently permitted in the ALR. They discussed the potential of only allowing 1 additional dwelling unit and agreed that a P.Ag. report be required to justify the need for any additional dwelling units.	<i>This section has been amended to specify that the additional dwelling unit must be for full-time farm workers for a farm operation and must be justified by a P.Ag. report. No change is proposed in the number of additional dwelling units from the existing Zoning Bylaw.</i>
10	MAL staff recommended that their standards be used to determine the amount of lot coverage permitted. The AAC and staff from the ALC agreed with this recommendation.	<i>The MAL lot coverage standards are proposed in the new Zoning Bylaw (i.e., 75% for greenhouses; 35% for all other agricultural buildings and structures).</i>
11	There was considerable discussion on the maximum floor area ratio (0.60) and maximum lot coverage (45%) proposed for single detached housing, buildings and accessory structures in the agriculture and golf course zones.	<i>Propose to continue to use the existing 0.6 floor area ratio for all buildings except greenhouses and to delete the proposed new 45% lot coverage provision for single detached housing. Both of these would continue to be applied on the lot in question, not a farm operation (i.e., multiple lots).</i>
12	MAL staff recommended that their standards be used to determine setbacks for agricultural buildings and structures.	<i>The MAL setbacks are in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw. They were favorably reviewed by the AAC and staff from the ALC.</i>
13	MAL and ALC staff requested that agricultural buildings and structures be allowed a higher height. The AAC agreed.	<i>City staff have increased the maximum height for agricultural buildings and structures to 35.0 m.</i>
14	There was considerable discussion between staff from the MAL, ALC and City regarding the minimum lot sizes in the agriculture, golf course and roadside stand zones. The AAC expressed no concerns or objections to what was agreed to by these staff.	<i>It was agreed to use a 2.0 ha minimum lot size if the subdivision is approved by the ALC in the agriculture and golf course zones. There is no minimum lot size proposed for the roadside stand zone.</i>
15	Based on provincial bylaw standards, MAL staff recommended that the number of seasonal farm labourers be increased from 30 to 40 and that the size of a seasonal farm labour accommodation be increased from 300 m <sup>2</sup> to 400 m <sup>2</sup> .	<i>City staff agreed to this recommendation. The AAC suggested that there be this consistency and staff from the ALC expressed no objections or concerns to the changes.</i>
16	MAL staff requested that netting, fencing and/or landscaping screen be provided along a golf course & driving range. ALC staff also requested that for new golf courses and driving ranges this requirement be reviewed after one year of operation.	<i>This requirement was added to driving ranges to prevent golf balls from landing on adjacent agricultural or residential lands. The AAC agreed to this requirement. Staff will consider the 1 year review if a new golf course &amp; driving range is proposed.</i>
17	MAL and ALC staff expressed concern that 35% lot coverage was too high for a roadside stand.	<i>City staff agreed to limit the 35% lot coverage to the area zoned for a roadside stand. The AAC agreed with this approach.</i>
18	MAL staff questioned what type of landscaping would be required in the roadside stand zone.	<i>Proposed that landscaping only be required along any roads. The AAC and staff from the ALC were made aware of this.</i>



**Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500  
(New Zoning Bylaw Text and Maps  
for the Entire City of Richmond)**

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

1. Richmond Zoning & Development Bylaw 5300, as amended from time to time, is repealed.
2. Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500 is enacted, including:
  - a) Schedule A attached to and forming part of Bylaw 8500 (new zoning text); and
  - b) Schedule B attached to and forming part of Bylaw 8500 (new zoning maps).
3. This Bylaw may be cited as **“Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500”**.

FIRST READING

PUBLIC HEARING

SECOND READING

THIRD READING

ADOPTED

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

CITY OF RICHMOND
APPROVED by
HB
APPROVED by Director or Solicitor
D

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

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