

Handbook for Environment & Hazardous Condition DP Areas
APPENDIX F—CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING SETBACK REDUCTIONS

General criteria for assessing the *need* to encroach into a Riparian Management Area:

Criterion	Comments
<p>A) Area: Is sufficient area outside the Riparian Management Area for a “reasonable” building envelope? (“reasonable” determined by site constraints, average size/footprint of buildings of that nature)</p>	<p><i>“Yes” indicates encroachment not necessary; other setbacks may need to be varied.</i></p> <p><i>“No” indicates encroachment may be necessary.</i></p>
<p>B) Site constraints: Are there significant constraints posed by topography, other environmental features, or ROWs on building outside the Riparian Management Area?</p>	<p><i>“Yes” indicates encroachment may be necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Assuming sufficient area for a building envelope. “No” indicates encroachment not necessary; other setbacks may need to be varied.</i></p>
<p>C) Other opportunities: Are opportunities available to avoid the Riparian Management Area by varying other setbacks or requirements without seriously compromising site use or neighbourhood character?</p>	<p><i>“Yes” indicates encroachment not necessary but other setbacks or requirements need to be varied.</i></p> <p><i>“No” indicates encroachment may be necessary.</i></p> <p><i>In some cases, encroachment may be necessary but can be reduced by jointly varying other setbacks or requirements.</i></p>
<p>D) Orientation and design: Have options to locate proposed structure(s) out of the Riparian Management Area, or to design a structure that adapts to the site constraints been exhaustively explored?</p>	<p><i>If “Yes” but still insufficient space outside the Riparian Management Area, encroachment is necessary.</i></p> <p><i>“No” indicates need to explore these alternatives before determining the necessity for encroachment.</i></p>

Handbook for Environment & Hazardous Condition DP Areas
APPENDIX F—CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING SETBACK REDUCTIONS

General criteria for assessing potential *impact* to the Riparian Management Area, where encroachment is proposed.

Criterion	<i>Comments</i>
A) Is the Riparian Management Area naturally vegetated vs. recently cleared or replaced with lawn, pavement, etc? Are there significant trees or treed areas in the Riparian Management Area? (see Tree Protection Bylaw 8041)	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact (but need to require restorative replanting within remaining Riparian Management Area).</i>
B) Does the Riparian Management Area contain a steep ravine or steep slopes in excess of 30%?	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact (because of potential bank instability caused by encroachment).</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact.</i>
C) Are there signs of slumping, erosion, or windthrow in the Riparian Management Area (which could be aggravated by further disturbance)?	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact.</i>
D) Is the stream fish bearing? Does the stream lead directly into a fish-bearing stream?	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact.</i>
E) Are there other environmentally sensitive features in the Riparian Management Area (nest trees, small side channel that may provide seasonal fish habitat)?	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact.</i>
F) Is the stream, or stream Riparian Management Area, part of an existing or proposed linear park or trail system?	<i>"Yes" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"No" indicates lesser impact.</i>
G) Is an enhancement (or restoration) plan proposed for Riparian Management Area as part of the application?	<i>"No" indicates greater impact.</i> <i>"Yes" indicates lesser impact.</i>