

7.5.23 meeting memo

#6 Joy suggested revisiting PC **goals**: let's look at those in conjunction with the question of residential uses in the C and I/C districts. I have put a Y/N after the main points so the PC can state "yes" or "no" whether they are in agreement with the statements, so we can have a consensus that we refer to in future discussions.

Some **general** goals that we have articulated over the last few years (lifted from various PC documents): (Y/N)

1. Align RZR with Richmond's 2018 Town Plan
2. Respond to new needs and conditions currently affecting Richmond residents
3. Update and modernize RZR by correcting ambiguities, omissions and inconsistencies
4. Consider new statewide planning efforts and incorporate new legally-binding state statutes into the RZR

Some **more specific** goals that we decided on: (Y/N)

5. To amend the RZR one district at a time and then, at the end, consolidate into one consistent document (to avoid the difficulties of the 2012 rewrite attempt)
6. To work outwards from the village zoning districts (as a continuation of work on Jolina Court and the Village Downtown districts)
7. To work to remove barriers to housing (as recommended by the Housing Committee consultant's report) in response to the housing shortage
8. To add elements that work towards climate change mitigation where possible

To me, the work we are doing around the C and I/C districts works on goals 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, especially 2 and 7. Our work on the village neighborhoods and village commercial district has been stalled by the need to understand and incorporate S. 100, so we are now moving outward beyond the Gateway, so not far off from 6 either.

If that seems consistent with our ongoing trajectory, let's look at the C and I/C and the Beals' project.

1. It seems we are all agreed that the Beals should be able to have a house lot where indicated. (Y/N)

How should this be accomplished? The options I see are: (Y/N)

- a) Add "dwelling, single-family" (+/- other residential uses) as permitted or conditional use(s) to current I/C district
- b) Remove the Donovans' parcel +/- other residential parcels from the I/C and put them in a district that allows single family dwellings (A/R? HDR? other?)
- c) Make the northern part part or the whole of the I/C district +/- the C district into an R/C district (suggested by Beals)
- d) Other?

Then, in addition,

- e) Make any other changes that would be needed to accomplish a), b) or c)
- f) Make any other changes that would make sense in pursuit of our #1 goal from a consistency, efficiency or other point of view, such as combining part or all of the C and I/C districts into a single C district which allowed dwellings

2. What are the pros and cons of each of these strategies?

a) Add “dwelling, single-family” (+/- other residential uses) as use to I/C district

Pros:

- Removes barriers to housing
- In I/C north, 4 of 7 lots are already dwellings, so nonconformity would be reduced
- There are 160 dwellings next door in MHP
- Would potentially open up more land to housing in the future if needed
- More options for owners of land in I/C
- All other commercial uses still allowed
- Would resolve ambiguity with PUD section (5.12.2) which allows for PUD and PRD in I/C but residences not listed as allowed uses
- I/C south unlikely to be affected (solar array)
- I/C Kenyon surrounded by A/R so neighboring dwellings already allowed nearby

Cons:

- Could allow residential uses to displace commercial uses
- Would need some development standards to be added to I/C
- Doesn't fix any other issues with Exit 11 districts

b) Remove the Donovans' parcel (+/- other residential parcels) from the I/C district and put them in another district, likely A/R or HDR

Pros:

- Removes barriers to housing
- If 4 residential parcels removed, nonconformity within is I/C reduced
- would restrict potential residential-use displacement of land set aside for commercial uses to smaller area than in a) above
- only change needed is ZRZ map, no text changes needed anywhere else in document (so e) not needed)

Cons:

- doesn't fix any other issues with Exit 11 districts
- removes some commercial options from the residential lots

A/R vs HDR: (we would need to decide which way to go)

- Both have same uses except A/R allows kennel and HDR allows 3-4 unit multifamilies.
- Dimensionals are slightly larger in A/R (front yard = 30' vs 20'), frontage slightly longer in A/R (100' vs 75') and maximum coverage slightly smaller in A/R (30% vs 40%)

c) Make the I/C north (or the whole I/C) into an R/C district

Pros:

- Could allow more commercial uses than b) above but modify existing I/C uses to be more like other existing R/C districts – if no changes in the uses were made, it would look like a)

Cons:

- Would require more time and thought than a) or b) above
-

3. I am assuming that no one wants to try to work this into a consideration of the whole Exit 11 area at this time as in f) above (Y/N)

So, if we decide on b) above as the simplest and quickest way to achieve our Beals goal, and decide to leave the reorganization of the C and I/C districts for a later time, we could move to set up a public hearing for this action: (Y/N)

"I, _____, move that the Planning Commission hold a warned public hearing on _____ to consider a proposed change in the Richmond Zoning Regulations Map to remove parcels RG0090, RG0140, RG0226, and RG0300 from the I/C zoning district and add them to the _____ zoning district, with the appropriate Amendment Bylaw Report."