

What We Heard and What We Changed

Current Regulation	Initial Draft Regulation	What we Heard	What we Changed from the Draft	Rationale
RA7 Section 210.4.6 - Side Setbacks				
Interior Side Setback 1.2 m with 3.0 m Setback above 10.0 m	Interior Side Setback 3.0 m	<p>Key themes that arose from consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Side setbacks should be 1.2m or 1.5m to facilitate small lot development 2. Keep side setback tied to building height 3. Increasing interior side setbacks without also adjusting front and rear setbacks would constrain building footprints and reduce the buildability of sites 4. Provide different tools and options to reduce massing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced the interior setback to 1.5 m for buildings less than 10 m • Required the increased 3.0 m setback for buildings over 10 m only 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rather than require a 3 m setback in all cases, the setback was reduced to 1.5 m in order to accommodate small lot development. 2. Revised to provide options for setbacks depending on building height. 3. & 4. Due to the tight scope of the project, feedback regarding regulations other than side setbacks have been included as part of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal consultation work.
RA8 Section 220.4.6				
Interior Side Setback 1.2 m with 3.0 m Setback above 10.0 m	<p>Interior Side Setback <i>where abutting Zone that permits Single Detached Housing</i> 3.0 m Setback with 6.0 m Setback above 14.5 m</p> <p>Interior Side Setback <i>in all other cases for sites less than 1 ha</i> 3.0 m</p>	<p>Key themes that arose from consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require a 3.0 m setback for buildings between 10.0 m and 23.0 m in height 2. Reduce stepback from 3.0 m to 2.0 m above 14.5 m in height 3. Stepbacks in wood-frame buildings require additional structural and envelope engineering costs and they create small flat roofs which increase the risk of envelope compromise 4. The scope of these amendments should be expanded to include sites over 1 ha and to address the distinction between front, rear and side property lines 5. Include a uniform setback of 3.0 m from all property lines 6. If standard zones are too restrictive industry will continue to seek out direct control zones to ensure site viability 7. Develop clear regulations for landscaping buffers as an option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced the interior setback to 1.5 m for buildings less than 10 m • Required the increased 3.0 m setback for buildings over 10 m only • Maintained the proposed stepback of 3.0 m above 14.5 m height when abutting a site that allows single detached housing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rather than require a 3 m setback in all cases, the setback was reduced to 1.5 m in order to accommodate small lot development. 2. The proposed stepback remains at 3.0 m in order to provide sufficient width to reduce perceived massing, create interest, and improve transition from higher to lower buildings. 3. Increasing the height at which the stepback is required, from the current 10.0 m to 14.5 m, balances the additional development costs of a stepback by increasing the building pocket for lower storeys. 4. 5. 6. & 7. Due to the tight scope of the project, feedback regarding regulations other than side setbacks have been included as part of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal consultation work.