

Our City, Our Homes Verbatim Comments **Survey, Open House & Virtual Event**



City of New Westminster
APRIL 25 2025

Our City, Our Homes - Open House Comments for Affordable Housing Station on March 1st, 5th, and 8th 2025

The following comments were transcribed from hand written notes. While all efforts are made to ensure accuracy, human transcription may contain minor errors.

Affordable Housing - General

- 1 Want to see more housing of all types - especially for younger generations
- 2 Would like to see more treatment centers rather than safe supply programs (giving out drugs)
- 3 Strong support for complex care beds by the hospital
- 4 More deep subsidy senior rental housing
- 5 Municipally owned housing, renters non-targeted, and land assembly by city essentially put a floor under renter costs
- 6 More non-market seniors housing near amenities
- 7 Housing for next stage in life - independent assisted living facilitate integrated in community?
- 8 etc)

Considering the background and these criteria, what is your level of support for the City to allow affordable rental housing projects in New Westminster's Transit Oriented Development Areas?

- 1 Consider affordable housing near skytrain stations/TOAs because those who live in these housing cannot afford cars
- 2 Would also like to see government subsidized housing allowed under this project
- 3 increase
- 4 The city should consider allowing social/non-market housing of any density, not just six stories
- 5 Maintain livability and quality of projects (Re. design guidelines)
- 6 (family housing) better acoustic/sound attenuation in woodframe building
- 7 Consider whether transportation, infrastructure, amenities have capacity to support proposed projects
- 8 Needs to get unpacked further - targeted audience vision + what would these audiences need?

What is your level of support for allowing affordable rental housing projects to be built in the locations proposed for townhouses?

- 1 Prezone these areas to build affordable housing
- 2 Concerned about infrastructure and amenities (which are old and at capacity) not able to support these developments

- 3** Don't like idea of affordable housing being part of all areas designated on the above map. Should have affordable housing in designated areas not next to single family homes/RGO → would change dynamics of existing communities
- 4** Single-stair code change should allow 4 stories or more on 1 lot. Would be nice for fine grain urbanism
- 5** Downtown is way too dense
- 6** more services/amenities in these areas to support these projects

Our City, Our Homes - Open House Comments for Infill Housing Station on March 1st, 5th, and 8th 2025

The following comments were transcribed from hand written notes. While all efforts are made to ensure accuracy, human transcription may contain minor errors.

Infill Housing - General

- 1 Construction costs are so high. What influence can the city have on making it more affordable for homeowners to build more units on their properties?
- 2 Want to build carriage house with higher FSR and 2 storeys and want the timeline to be faster
- 3 Want laneway houses to be allowed to be bigger - too small right now
- 4 Interested in pre-approved designs as a way to make cheaper to build new units on property - many lots same size
- 5 Interested in potentially adding multiple stratified units as from family perspective it gives flexibility that members could sell.
- 6 If only rental also more difficult to afford to build it. Interested in having garages, not just carports, to make home more viable
- 7 Have house in front and laneway home - two lane garage and then living space on top i.e. coach house on top of a double car garage to preserve parking on lots
- 8 Would like to see infill housing in Queensborough too
- 9 Want to make sure these developments provide adequate parking, at least 1 space per unit. Should contribute to amenities in the City. New West unique because people commute through here to get to other places - more traffic.
- 10 Would like to see flexibility for larger laneway houses so that units can be more similar in size, and can have separate titles, for all varieties of unit configurations. Super happy to see infill housing program, just want to see it roll out faster
- 11 Would like to see more opportunities for laneway houses
- 12 Would like to see more parking per unit, maybe 2 per home
- 13 Like look of row homes and of duplex with secondary basement
- 14 All laneway houses should be built on top of a garage. 1 house, 1 coach house, no more.
- 15 Set minimum unit sizes and number of bedrooms, but don't limit narrow lots.
- 16 Don't do many 1 bedroom units like Toronto did
- 17 These boards are boring and legalese
- 18 Balance heritage and growth with infill support
- 19 We need to allow more creativity on fitting lane houses affordability
- 20 Ensure all new housing is electric (not gas) and energy efficient
- 21 We are in Tier 3 in Queens Park, we would like to build a carriage home and be able to sell it separately - do not want 8 storey in our area
- 22 Small lot subdivision may allow for the some total number of units as 4 units on single lot with the benefit of giving home owners the revenue to fund the build. Front to back duplexes could be built on the subdivided lots

- 23 Own a condo now, would next want a townhouse, then manage later an infill housing property - do want to see more supply but also mindful of traffic and construction
- 24 Energy save New West - should be part of the conversation, in addition to the utility, for impacts to the grid
- 25 Would like to see a minimum unit size, keep liveable
- 26 Where could we put a new school - this is a problem. City needs to be proactive, advocate to the school board. Families are living in high rises
- 27 I'm in Tier 3 and I want to build infill for intergenerational living
- 28 Would maybe be interested in being able to build infill housing in TOA - maybe downsize age in place - want laneway house to be big enough, 1200 square foot, 980 not enough.
- 29 High costs for road improvements, sidewalk replacement with widening boulevard, street light replacement, take out tree. \$200k. Big developers should pay more, not small owners. Should be reasonable and commensurate to size of project.
- 30 Infill is the way to go - don't want to build into nature conservancies, better to build in the city together
- 31 Don't want to see infill in Transit Areas, would be small step forward that would prevent a big step forward, not enough densification
- 32 Relaxed constraints for laneway houses would be good - lower threshold for owner -> developer to participate
- 33 gardens
- 34 School capacity?
- 35 Parks and rec - we don't have capacity
- 36 Rainwater integration requirement and greenspace/biodiversity
- 37 Rainwater needs to be addressed and open space/yards maintained
- 38 Major concerns are traffic and parking
- 39 Concerns of parking and lane widths for emergency vehicle

What are your priorities for housing, green space, and parking? Tell us why.

- 1 There's a mental health issue if you have no green space, and there's a transportation issue if you have no parking but there's also an issue if you have no housing
- 2 Inforce when residents are not using their off street parking - becoming less parking on street
- 3 Pedestrian activated crossing for 7th Ave @ 28th st. to access 22nd st. station often blocked by southbound vehicle traffic stopped in intersection. We need "block the box" ticket camera there as used in Seattle + elsewhere
- 4 City should advocate with Provincial government to grandfather tax rates of homeowners in TOD area. We don't want to be coerced out of our family home by being taxed as potential tower site. We'd rather build a laneway house and have our 3 generations there
- 5 Eliminate parking minimums for more comfortable and safer spaces

- 6** Basements should not count as FSR
- 7** Look at the lots on 5th and 10th
- 8** Make sure infill is mindful of neighbours
- 9** Please consider taxing high rise developers for city engineering priorities
- 10** Support small infill homes in areas zoned for infill - currently the cost is prohibitive
- 11** City process and costs are prohibiting infill development (eg. intersection improvement)
- 12** Allow "crawl space" to be full height to increase housing supply
- 13** Staff need to do a better job respective and engaging with immediate exist[ing] residents about privacy and over look
- 14** I support infill housing in tier 3
- 15** Intergenerational living is great
- 16** Allow duplex on single four lot that are freehold not strata
- 17** Off-street parking
- 18** Canada
- 19** We have already done our part.
- 20** Concerns with parking, school capacity - not enough portables, not enough other amenities, not enough room in community centre swim programs or other programs
- 21** Want to make sure infrastructure is sufficient to support increase in density eg. water main breaker
- 22** Can infill meet a min permeable surface area of ISMP? For flexibility
- 23** My concern is increase density will result in more parking on side street
- 24** I feel hopeful for my family
- 25** Are there any developers out there who aren't going to charge an arm and a leg for rent?
- 26** My concern is there may be a loss in parks or a reduction in size of the parks
- 27** Priorities: parking, trees, views, biodiversity, livable, permeable surfaces stormwater.
- 28** Worried that there won't be room for nature if this much density
- 29** Need sun for vegetable garden
- 30** Maybe 3-4 could fit all these priorities - if we did 6 then we couldn't
- 31** Want to keep main house - interested in adding 2 units in 1 building for a total of 3 units (1 rental = mortgage helper)
- 32** On property with no laneway - want to give kids one of the units strata.
- 33** Want to be able to share unit for kids to also own. Open to townhouse too
- 34** Like to think of New West as the small town in the big city
- 35** Worried will lose the connections have with your neighbours when you sit outside beside each other; continuous green space
- 36** Thinking about additional traffic, and safety impacts for that because people don't work in New West, we are stuck as a thoroughfare and even with traffic calming, idling isn't good either

What kinds of infill housing would you like to see in your neighbourhood?

- 1** Associated municipal costs to develop infill kill projects
- 2** Reasonable city process (eg. engineering)
- 3** Own 2 back to back lots, want to build a quadplex or maybe 2 quadplexes
- 4** burden
- 5** Where a neighbour has invested in solar panels, require a setback to mitigate impact. Eg. indigenous building next to high school
- 6** Sustainable home info session
- 7** City should require more permeable surfaces and trees in the boulevard and verge, not astro turf, for climate resilience, biodiversity, mental health, storm water management, flood prevention etc on all city owned properties between sidewalk and property line
- 8** Trees, sidewalk, storm water - improve biodiversity and resilience to heat waves
- 9** P70/74 of provincial policy - Require streetscape - min standard
- 10** Recommend measures to protect existing solar panels and battery storage, such as setbacks on south, west, and east sides to help mitigate peak demand to maintain viability of homeowners investing in solar and batteries
- 11** Use this option for large old heritage houses
- 12** Where are the trees?
- 13** White roofs for cooling, green roofs? Bylaw requirements to be considered
- 14** I like all of the images for the multi-units housing except the multi-unit building with prioritized parking because we need to realize not everyone will need to own a car as we move into the future with better transit, bike lanes and pedestrian infrastructure - a sustainable future
- 15** It would be helpful, if the FSR is between 1.0-1.3, because it allows for better design - intra - generational homes. Increased opportunity for greenspace

Our City, Our Homes - Open House Comments for Townhouse Station on March 1st, 5th, and 8th 2025

The following comments were transcribed from hand written notes. While all efforts are made to ensure accuracy, human transcription may contain minor errors.

Townhouse - General

- 1** TH Questions → Survey needs space for open ended questions
- 2** Not much difference usually between 2.5 and 3 storeys
- 3** Parking for secondary suite not necessary but need 1 space per principal unit
- 4** Value of landlift should be considered/used towards more CAC's if rezoning
- 5** More parking per units
- 6** Consider visitors/seniors and accessibility
- 7** Consider people wanting to visit/interact with each other
- 8** Why not 3.5-4 storeys?
- 9** Parking is a problem. People tend to have cars.
- 10** I don't want to visit people who live near the Quay or other areas eg. Vancouver
- 11** Opens up for abuse of systems of infrastructure. Secondary suites should be used for family already in home
- 12** Pre-zone to 4-storey for 2+ single-stair units on the lot
- 13** Ensure parking is electric charging ready. Maybe a battery in every apartment instead of substation upgrade
- 14** modo
- 15** Consider allowing developers to include model carshare spaces
- 16** Eliminate parking minimums to allow for more people-centered communities
- 17** Depends on neighbourhood context - shadowing/topography FF x 3rd level
- 18** Consider ground floor partially as basement
- 19** Need to consider neighbourhood context - preserve community feel, walkability, amenities
- 20** Concerns regarding issues of privacy and overlook for general comment
- 21** Mature tree protection on current lots - prioritize when assigning/permitting townhouse/infill development
- 22** Concern about secondary suites and parking

Scenario 1

- 1** Where is the integration with all city - sewer - water - electricity - etc plan?
- 2** What is the plan for the electrical grid?
- 3** What is the plan for sewage?
- 4** What is the plan for traffic flow?
- 5** What is the plan for water?
- 6** What is the plan for parking?
- 7** plus impact on adjacent homes
- 8** parking, sewer, electricity, water

- 9 close enough to skytrain
- 10 Not enough townhouses on 12th street, Glenbrook N
- 11 We didn't buy a house to be next to townhouses - why do this to a nice single detached home
- 12 There are a lot of new big expensive homes in the properties identified - they don't want TH next to them
- 13 Princess is a narrow street with parking only on one side
- 14 Concern about impact on sunlight
- 15 Condense townhouse designated areas where there aren't any single family dwellings or RGO's to keep character of RGO neighborhoods intact
- 16 Preserving existing tree and ecosystems is also important
- 17 Prioritize canopy and greenspace nature along with parking density
- 18 Don't sacrifice livability and community for densification

Scenario 2

- 1 Consider freehold townhouses
- 2 Freehold townhouses
- 3 Land strata townhouses or freehold
- 4 Affordability
- 5 Like to see more public green space/parklets
- 6 Along some of the streets below 6 ave
- 7 Schools are already full with portables?
- 8 Where are all of the spaces going to come from with more children?
- 9 These posters re: townhouses are confusing as it is unclear that these changes could be all affordable housing options and not free market housing
- 10 The park is so busy now - what will it be like when there are so many townhouses?
- 11 Like development providing streetscape improvements eg. street lighting, consistent sidewalks
- 12 I live in "TH scenario 2" on a lane - we want to build intergenerational housing ie. multiplex
- 13 Lots of townhouse style development potential in Brow of the hill (my neighbourhood)
- 14 Brow has lots of apartments. Good place for more family friendly townhomes similar type of density
- 15 Make sense in brow to have townhouses. Need more family friendly options, including 3+ bedrooms. Condos too.

Scenario 3

- 1 Good, but such development need to be accompanied with more frequent and reliable bus service
- 2 Owner in Tier 3 existing townhouse development. Aging, expensive. We want to sell for redevelopment 7 acres with 85th's

- 3** Variety of townhouse designs - not all 3 story - many seniors in New West - stack them?
- 4** Consider stacked townhouses too
- 5** I am in Tier 3 and want to redevelop the old townhouses for more diversity
- 6** So developers can offer to rezone without the knowledge of existing owners?
- 7** More city/provincial run multi-unit housing
- 8** More density will result in a lot less park/green space for those neighbourhoods eg. Sapperton park can't be expanded decreasing quality of life
- 9** More freehold bareland strata townhouses
- 10** Any redevelopment should not be allowed to skip rezoning
- 11** Likelihood of all this development and its timelines?
- 12** There are a lot of high ecological value (biodiverse) gardens in this area, townhouses do not keep/protect open space
- 13** More than people need to live here - birds, insects, coyotes
- 14** More townhouses - more people should be able to live in New West
- 15** go big it's a crisis
- 16** Like townhouses, but too much density city-wide with TOD areas
- 17** Need more traffic calming on 7th ave and 6th and McBride
- 18** Townhouse should not be in single family areas
- 19** Townhouses should be on 8th Ave in the West End off 12th street and on 12 Street and on 6th street
- 20** Would be nice to see people not need to move to Langley or Maple Ridge.
- 21** Would like to see more townhomes and condo buildings so my kids can stay here to live in New West.
- 22** We should have more social housing all over City, not just in one area, not just uptown or the Brow
- 23** Want to support density around shops on E Columbia - but not on Richmond
- 24** Makes sense along busy streets (6th, 8th)
- 25** it
- 26** Want to see a laneway - instead of more houses with driveways on Blackman (even if not that excited about townhouses)
- 27** Townhouses are too dense with too many people. Schools capacity concerns.
- 28** Because already apartments and townhomes. 8th Ave THs
- 29** Brimstone - Parks already overcapacity and in poor condition
- 30** Want to see push back to Province.

Our City, Our Homes - Open House Comments for Transit Oriented Session on March 1st, 5th, and 8th 2025

The following comments were transcribed from hand written notes. While all efforts are made to ensure accuracy, human transcription may contain minor errors.

If you think the proposed extensions should be modified, or you do not support the proposed extensions shown on the maps, please share why.

- 1** Would like to see better pathways to the transit stations for people
- 2** Construction taking a very long time on Sherbrooke. Need better coordinates so not redoing work and taking longer.
- 3** Too narrow on Sherbrooke
- 4** More and better buses to transit (skytain) stations
- 5** Extensions should be townhouses
- 6** Disagree with principle #1 - this would lead to abrupt boundaries based on roads
- 7** Support - allows more housing options within the TOD.
- 8** Need more family oriented housing - allows a transition and full parcels to be developed
- 9** Do not extend TOD Tier 3 boundary to include all of 323 Governors court - these are some of the last family - oriented townhouses in New West close to amenities
- 10** It looks like the river side of sixth avenue between sixteenth and eighteenth satisfies the principles. What gives?
- 11** Long construction at Quay is a pain.
- 12** Need to improve ER access and schools if more people.
- 13** Makes sense to have more density near skytrains, not just parks, need all services.
- 14** Push back harder against the Province.
- 15** No extension on E Eight Ave
- 16** Principle #2 is a reasonable compromise, but 4-plex pre-zone would be better transition from RS-1
- 17** Disagree Principle #3 Strongly
- 18** Encourage single lot 6-storey redevelopment by pre-zoning in line with single stair Leg.
- 19** Consider removing requirement for public hearing for properties in transit oriented areas
- 20** Consider removing public hearing requirement for HRA applications
- 21** Need a traffic plan
- 22** Think: add areas designated open to increase area
- 23** These additives are good
- 24** More ground level commercial (mixed-use) buildings along E Eighth Ave
- 25** More daily amenity (convenience store, grocery, post office, dry cleaner, etc) closer to where people live
- 26** Meet the housing order.

- 27** The city needs to provide housing for hospital workers
- 28** This area is ideal for transportation
- 29** Rezoning should be considered for the TOA
- 30** Everything on the East side of Richmond st. should be added to the TOA
- 31** Leave these properties out of the TOA
- 32** More whistle cessation needs to happen
- 33** Lack of capacity to meet anticipated electricity demand in this neighbourhood 323 governors court
- 34** 7 acre property; approx 150 people; 85 townhouses; close to skytrain; suitable for increased density and accommodate a school (323 Governor court)
- 35** Developers have to stage on own lands.
- 36** More opportunities for greenspaces temporarily
- 37** Used car lots should be rezoned to allow residential uses
- 38** Residential uses should be allowed in addition to the existing development right on C + ME designated sites
- 39** Seventh clear divide. Block ends works better then mixing the two
- 40** Character and heritage is very crucial for NW - concern over loss of this
- 41** Is it an option to prezone? And avoid the rezoning application cost and wait time - more affordable housing faster. If it is, recommend considering pre zoning 6 storey and townhouse
- 42** Vehicles should be able to access the Queensborough bridge directly from 6th ave marine way
- 43** Collector street site access? (with arrow point up and to the left)
- 44** The OCP is required to report on the City's GHG pollution. Please include this information in the future.
- 45** Residents have a right to know that we are not successful at reducing this pollution and will need bigger measures to meet our 2030 targets for our kids' sake
- 46** Your TOD A housing choice board - recommend townhouses and apartments in tier 2 but not infill housing but not apartments in tier 3 but this was not a choice
- 47** Social isolation
- 48** People don't know neighbours
- 49** How to foster a sense of community?
- 50** Block parties help in my SD area
- 51** Safe streets place for kids to play coops?
- 52** The properties along 6th street between 8th ave and 10th ave should be 5-6 storey apartments
- 53** Would like to see stronger protections for threats given potential redevelopments, like right to return, compensation, temporary accommodation - don't want displacement

- 54 There is an excess of parking uptown - parking needs should be reassessed in uptown
- 55 Would like for retail/restaurant spaces to still be considered in TOD areas
- 56 A 22nd st visioning process should happen for the Saperton - Braid TOA
- 57 12th st commercial is important
- 58 Upper 12th street OCP need updating
- 59 Bike locks at skytrain stations - similar to Main st. station
- 60 Advocacy for more skytrain capacity in response to this legislation
- 61 Development criteria is needed for homeowners on what would impact their ability to build higher density

TOD - General

- 1 Concerned about traffic onto HWY
- 2 Need to consider hospital traffic for high density
- 3 Council should be at consultation event
- 4 Columbia square lack of amenities, doesn't model TOA, lack of schools
- 5 These circles do not reflect walking distance via streets eg. 6th aberta is a 15min walk to Sapperton
- 6 800m too small - walktime would be better. Sky "5min"
- 7 Rezoning should be done by city
- 8 Support density but need roads to support
- 9 Increase bus services in these areas - Bus service on E eighth Ave
- 10 Design and tax incentives - Require solar panels, rainwater filters - super important
- 11 Open space and landscaping incentives in design guidelines
- 12 Want a carriage house in the TOD area
- 13 More bus frequency on E Eighth ave like Edmonds
- 14 RS-1 zoned property in T3 of TOD should have SSMUH entitlements
- 15 LMS 178
- 16 Parking in the City is too difficult
- 17 Parking overflow impacts
- 18 6th street school congestion is too difficult - bike lane usage is non-existent
- 19 6th Street bike lane causes too much congestion
- 20 Parklets are not good for traffic
- 21 City needs to consider Seniors. Biking is not an option - there are reasons we can't go far
- 22 A better bus system will allow me to
- 23 Challenges to redevelop in New west
- 24 Look at Coquitlam for rezoning
- 25 Build more housing and make it easier
- 26 Transition in density is important
- 27 Supportive of the density change
- 28 Green initiative in the design guidelines
- 29 Is the city considering view corridors?

- 30** Importance of infrastructure funding
- 31** Local character are important for TOD areas
- 32** Sidewalk maintenance
- 33** Bikes off the sidewalk
- 34** Parking and curbside management in TOD areas is a concern
- 35** Parking for carshare
- 36** Existing density should be shown
- 37** Schools planning and lane access is crucial with TOD areas. Walkability is important
- 38** Single egress stairs should be permitted in TOD areas
- 39** Schools and parkland in TOD areas

TOD - Housing Choice

- 1** Infill and townhouses in Tier 2/3 but not more apartments in Sapperton - not enough park/school/amenities
- 2** Will current RS1 zoned properties that fall in Tier 3 of Sapperton TOD be included in the Infill housing initiative - It's about choice
- 3** In fairness to RS1 homeowners in TOD tier 3 will the infill housing initiative be available to these homeowners?
- 4** TOD homeowners deserve the same opportunity to infill housing as other RS1 homeowners in the City

Our City, Our Homes - Survey Comments for Townhouse

Q12 (OPTIONAL: If you think the proposed scenarios should be modified, or you do not support the areas shown on the maps for townhouses to be allowed, please share why.)

It's infuriating that the City continues to limit additional housing choice to the busiest parts of the City and restricting quiet parts of our neighborhoods to the lowest density and thus the least accessible housing forms. For a City that talks about justice, equity, and addressing crisis, keeping townhouses illegal in most of the city is beyond difficult to
1 understand.

My concern is 8th Ave. There is a lot of traffic currently and adding the densification to
2 this corridor will make New West traffic even worse than it already is.

3 Should be more areas zoned for townhouses across the city.

There should be no restrictions on townhomes. New West does not have enough and
4 families need places to live.

I think we should focus on scenario 1 to encourage townhouses as transition. This will encourage developers to focus on those areas. Once those areas are built out with townhouses the City can expand areas for townhouse growth. I think jumping to a much expanded area will result in patchy and inconsistent growth in townhouse development that will compromise the livability, and accessibility of our community. Not everything has
5 to be done at once.

6 Should be for the entire city.

I do not like townhomes unless I am misunderstanding what they are. Row housing would be far better: maintaining the look of residential housing but increasing density. Again the area being proposed has a lot of garden friendly houses that support bees, insects and birds. This would have a detrimental impact at a time when we should be
7 supporting green spaces.

only allowing denser housing on major road networks is elitist and puts more of the population at respiratory health risk and reduces quality of life. Allow townhouses on
8 more residential streets.

9

Townhouses should have high end architectural merit and be built of superior material that last generations. In European urban centers, concrete, stone, glass and brick construction is the norm. Even though townhouses may only be 3 stories tall, they should
10 not be cheap wood construction that is boring.

I don't think townhouses should only be built off major residential road networks but more
11 into the residential areas.

I am very concerned that New West while increasing the housing (which does need to happen) is not addressing the infrastructure. There is only one secondary school with 2600 students, and elementary schools such as Lord Tweedsmuir is sitting in a sea of
12 portables.

Long stretches of townhouses can be really ugly, just like long stretches of condo buildings. They have the potential to look unloved very quickly. I am 100% in favour of densification! And townhouses are great. BUT the higher and narrower nature of townhouse design can look very cramped, which doesn't feel good to live in or to walk by.

I am in favour of 3-storey townhouses in principle but design will be very important to
13 keep NW looking and feeling like a liveable city.

I'm all for increasing density in a variety of forms but until there is more investment into road infrastructure to move vehicles efficiently in and out of new west and definitely keep bike lanes from all major arteries as to impede the flow of traffic when residents are just
14 trying to get to and from work

15 I would support scenario 2 as first choice if it meant saving some neighbourhoods
No more development until our infrastructure catches up. Our population density is the

16 2nd highest in Canada. Let the other, bigger cities catchup.

I will be directly affected by these changes, as my property is located in one of the locations included in scenario 3. Should I choose 2 because my property value will go up (will it go up?). What if there is pressure for me to sell with a land assembly? My entire life and retirement depends on this, and I have lived and paid taxes here in NW for over 25 years. Where will I go so you can make room for all the new people and homes? Maybe I should make scenario 2 my top choice and build a laneway in my back yard???

17 Have you considered all these impacts on your residents?

I just think it would be nice to be able to build more townhouses close to skytrain.

18 Families need skytrain access too!

New Westminster is already the densest city in all of Canada. It is unlivable. Stop

19 developing the crap out of it.

Townhouses need to be livable. 4-story townhouses, 12 feet wide, with secondary suites,
20 and no parking are NOT livable spaces. People buy them out of desperation.

Heritage and Queen's Park is nice and all, but give me a break -- multi housing can go in there too. There is a lot of land in our "special zones for the higher land based homes that are not farms, especially near Queen's Park and other parks. A little building or two

21 could work here too.

Please go even further than Scenario 3! Townhouses should be permitted in all of Queens Park and Brow of the Hill. These areas have great access to services and are very low density with mostly wealthy home owners. Queens Park owners have loud political voices but shouldn't drown out the needs of future residents without generational

22 wealth! Human health and wellbeing are more important than heritage.

I don't really care can you just make affordable housing for people specially seniors, and

23 people with disabilities and unhoused people without addictions

24 Keep historical homes

Building higher density housing like townhomes directly adjacent to major road networks adversely affects the livability of the potential families and residents living within those units.

Children, seniors, and those with disabilities would be exposed to increased pollution from vehicle emissions, particulate matter (from tires and brakes), not to mention

25 increased collision risks due to high volume and speeds of vehicles.

Sapperton west of Columbia Street is already full of market rental apartments. Do not

26 replace those with privately owned townhomes. Existing rental stock must be protected.

- a) prefer a mix of housing types - multiplex, stacked and row townhomes instead of a row of townhomes
 - b) some green spaces (miniparks, playgrounds, courtyard squares, sidewalk greenery) should be mandated among the increased density housing
 - c) mandate provision of 1 parking space per household, including rental units, for and
- 27** average of closer to 2 parking space per townhouse, 3+ per multiplex

If the Province has already imposed new zoning and created TOD areas, why is the City wasting time and money or creating new zoning for townhomes. I think there is enough radical change tasking place and maybe evaluating townhouse proposals as they come up might be a good thing as it is impossible at this point to determine the impacts of the newly imposed zoning changes. I think there should be sufficient development opportunities within the current location in the city. It is easy to make changes in the future then it will be to fix problems created by over development.

28 Ensure we don't continue mangling the view of New Westminster. Priority should be given to lower height buildings, not idiotic skyscrapers. We live in a paradise, it would be nice to see it every now and then.

29 MORE in Queens Park, Massey Heights!!!

30 Townhouses should be allowed on all of Tenth Ave, all of Eighth Ave and all of 6th Ave

Townhouses should be allowed on all RS zones. number of units to be based on lot width/area

31 Need more schools and green spaces

32 Too much density and nothing being built to support it

33 Allow people to build townhouses wherever they think is appropriate.

You can't increase density if you don't increase public transit (and good walking/mobility devices areas/bike lines) beyond Skytrain. Buses are already insufficient, particularly the small local buses and along 8th avenue where you have 3 levels of schools & a major amenities (sport center, parks). No more cars or parking should be allowed.

I would remove 6th Ave from Scenario 1 but I would add in more Townhomes around 8th Ave from Scenario 2. I also wouldn't have so many townhome areas around Richmond Street. While previously I would have supported having so many areas as Townhome, the fact that all single family areas will now allow for multiplex means that fewer Townhome areas should be designated. Focus on the major road network area where property owners will be the most likely to sell in a land assembly vs. quieter streets where development is likely to be more incremental (which is a better fit for multiplex).

34 Townhouses should be allowed anywhere. The privilege of single family homes being separated from higher density is not sustainable or equitable.

No such scenarios should be proposed. The planning department should not presume to know what the market for townhouses will be, or where people will want to build them.

This survey presents no market data indicating demand or desirability of any location in particular. It's just guesswork and there is no need for such speculation. The options proposed could seriously undermine the market for real estate in New Westminster, defeating the purpose.

Can you just make it 3-storey buildings and not be so prescriptive to townhouses? If someone can build a 3-storey 4-plex or apartment building or whatever, let's just do it.

40 Build housing not barriers.

If there was more accessible grocery shopping in Massey Victory Heights and upper Sapperton Area I might agree. You need a vehicle to get to stores in this area due to

41 walking back up the hill from either Columbia St or McBride and 8th Ave.

How about the Queens Park area, where there is lots of green space and recreation areas for families to enjoy and it has some of the oldest infrastructure in the city that needs upgrading. This could be done while building the new townhouses. If the change

42 must be done, then it must be fair to all citizens, not just a select few.

43 All townhouses and rowhouses throughout the city, including Queens Park

Lots along 6th Ave between 2nd & 5th, plus lots along 5th street have homes with character which is part of the charm of New Westminster. Generic townhouses along this

44 will create a mundane, could be anywhere cityscape.

I think the greatest density of townhomes should be within the tier 3 Transit Oriented

45 Development Area, not adjacent to it.

Funny enough you don't wanna allow townhouses in Queens Park to not bother the rich

46 families of New West, classism at its best! What a shame!

I believe the scenarios need to be modified when there is existing roof top solar that would be significantly negatively impacted. It is a big investment in solar (we have solar) and it wouldn't be fair (or good for climate action) if a 3 story townhouse could be built next door and block the solar panels. This risk would really put a chill on solar installation on buildings.

Also, not sure this is the most appropriate place to put this feedback, but for green infrastructure and biodiversity purposes the front set back should be 4 meters. The standards for Bill 44 – BC Housing Supply Act is front yard setbacks of only 2 meters for lots requiring a min. of 3-4 units, but you can't grow trees in 2 meters. The standards indicate some discretion is allowed and setbacks of 4-6 meters are options if there are no public boulevards for trees or stormwater infrastructure. The city should mandate the 3-4 m. front yard setback wherever there isn't a tree boulevard in order to:

increase the viability of trees, which are valuable for cooling and stormwater management, and

Give space for trees, shrubs and groundcovers, all of which are needed for healthy habitats for birds, pollinators and other insects

47

48 Is this for rentals and will there be rental controls or subsidies?

As more young people live at home longer due to the cost of living/housing, there are potentially more adults in a household now that have vehicles. So when you consider multi-vehicle households plus the vehicles of guests, and then increased density of townhomes, this makes our already narrower streets challenging to navigate and finding parking becomes a major nuisance. I would be supportive of additional townhouses and townhouses with secondary units if more off-street parking spaces were required (e.g.

49 1.5 - 2 spots per unit to accommodate households with extra cars and/or visitors).

Without knowing the plans for adding infrastructure, transit, school capacity, to match the population increase, it is hard to decide which scenario is the most feasible. I also like a small number of businesses (general store, barber/hair salon, bakery/deli, etc.) allowed to operate within residential zone. Those are the places where people in the

50 neighborhood develop connections.

51 We need more low income rental housing not townhouses

Scenario 4: Allow townhouses, duplexes and quadplexes across the entire city.

Why would the city only allow townhouses to front onto the major road network? So if you can't afford a detached home you get punished and have to live with excess vehicle noise and pollution? We only save the quiet parts of the city for the people who can afford the multi-million dollar homes? Too bad if you're a young adult couple trying to start a family. Your kids (if you can afford any) only get to play on the major road networks.

No doubt in my mind Scenario 1 is going to be the top choice for everyone who owns a home already. Crazy that we're still letting the people who were previously afforded the easiest opportunities at detached, single family homeownership dictate how we move forward to allow young people a chance at even a sliver of what they have. Stop with the

52 marginal gains and just remove all barriers to develop more housing.

Allowing secondary suites in townhouses makes it more affordable for home owners meanwhile creating one more living space for every townhouse that is built. I don't know why parking is always the issue when the city is spending millions on bike lanes to get

53 people out of cars but they always want more parking. MAKES NO SENSE

I think it's ridiculous that Queen's Park is left out of this. There are lovely older homes all over New West and to prioritize Queen's Park is to say that one particular kind of

54 heritage (white and wealthy) is more valued.

10'th avenue townhouse? The traffic there is uncomfortable for people to live next to that. I would put condos there instead with parking or business space on the first floor. to raise

55 the living space from negative impacts of traffic.

It seems row houses (fee simple) don't work here, which is unfortunate. If I were considering the row/townhouse form, I would much prefer fee simple ownership to

56 condominium unit ownership.

Allow townhouses everywhere outside the TOD areas. New West is small, you can walk

57 everywhere.

New West is already so dense. PLEASE build more amenities to catch up with the

58 previous 20 years of residential development first!!!!

The Queen's Park HCA should not exclude townhome development. Why should other neighbourhoods bare the load of additional density but not QP? There is a housing crisis that spans from deeply affordable supportive housing the missing middle. We shouldn't be creating arbitrary barriers to the creation of housing. Especially those that are only designed to preserve questionable colonial heritage and to massage the egos of the

59 comfortably housed.

Townhouses shouldn't impede on the nearby houses; they disrupt the character of single-family neighborhoods by increasing density, reducing green space, and altering the established aesthetic. Increased density leads to overcrowding, strained infrastructure, and insufficient parking lots, which impedes the quality of life of existing residents to lead ordinary lives. Moreover, townhouse developments use space previously occupied by mature trees and grass to build taller structures and asphalt, taking away the environmental benefits and isolation of the area. The shift from single-family dwellings to multi-unit dwellings can also impact property value and change the character of the community, making the area less appealing to those who prefer quieter, more expansive

60 living space.

61 prefer to minimize the expansion area

62 Leave us alone (I have a different term i won't use) .

Why would people want to live on noisy/polluting roads? I want to live on a quiet road with easy/quick access to amenities via (safe) cycling and/or transit. We should minimize housing on major roads and maximize them near amenities.

On the previous page, I don't understand the question "Draft Direction: Continue to require 1 off-street parking space per townhouse unit". If I say I don't support the current direction (which is no direction at all since the proposal is no change) will you think I want more parking spaces per unit or fewer parking spaces per unit? I want to indicate fewer,

63 but am afraid you'll misinterpret my answer as wanting more.

I'd like to see a hybrid townhouse/apartment building where 2 floors of condos are built above the townhomes. We'd specify the condo units be 2&3 bedrooms for families. Larger apartments add choice for families who can't afford a townhome but can't manage in a tiny high rise near the SkyTrain.

Also, can there be consideration to increased density where there are only a few single family lots in a block filled with low rise apartments, where the block is not near the

64 SkyTrain? I'm thinking of the area bounded by 4th and 6th Ave and 8th and 12th St.

Parking is an issue that needs to be addressed , and not just laying blame on bc government . It's our community and let's make it work for everyone. The larger these units, the more people . More people more cars being electric , car share or regular gas .

65 We need to do the right thing .

A commitment must be made to building accessible homes for disabled people too, and

66 ensuring adequate parking for residents and visitors.

With all this development how will the city be able to support residents with amenities such as schools, library, public transport. Seems like these already strained services

67 would be further pushed

All proposals need to be modified. Additionally, restricting development in Queens Park is yet again providing favoritism to a predominantly white and wealthy neighbourhood. Any plan that does not include provisions for townhouse type developments along 6th Ave or 5th street is a plan that should not be supported. Heritage can only be considered so far, if heritage is worth protecting, then allow town house type developments thru an HRA type program, or if existing structures retained, allow further density (additional

68 floors, reduction in parking, more FSR).

I have noticed in these scenarios that Glenbrook north is added to in all three scenarios. This area of the city is also on the higher percentage of tree canopy. Even if the first scenario is chosen and people want to develop in those areas a large number of older trees will be lost as a result. I would encourage the city to rethink these areas to densify where there is already minimal tree canopy and leave the areas that have a better tree canopy to more scrutiny when looking to develop.

It seems the city is willing to densify at any cost. Go too far, and people won't want to live here. And with so many options in the lower mainland why would they pick a place to live that has no trees and takes them longer to get to their front door from the city limits than
69 from the rest of their journey around the lower mainland.

Just in looking in my immediate neighbourhood, I see existing townhouses close by, which is, and has been, fine. But in all proposed scenarios I also see some homes in my neighbourhood that are either newly built (within the last three years) or recently renovated, and which have rental or secondary suites, which would be now zoned for townhouses. I find this alarming because these families have invested financially to make these changes, and their commitment to their homes and providing additional housing is high. This also applies to our home in scenario 2 and 3. We have a secondary suite already, and have considered adding a laneway house. Because townhouse developments provide denser housing than the current single family or dual family homes, I think there would be increased street traffic and so it makes sense to me that the townhouses are located along major traffic routes -- 8th Avenue, 6th Avenue, etc. In addition, it is extremely important to ensure consideration for green space around homes, whatever the type, as we know of the benefits to the climate, health and mental health of our citizens. Increased housing also means pressure on existing services and needs to be considered in tandem with expanded schools, daycares, park space access,

70 electrical, sewage and water, to name a few.

71 Increase townhouse areas even more

72 Do not allow any townhouses in the areas shown.

73 Not needed as TOD area should keep developers busy for many years

74 I do not support allowing townhouses on 10th or Blackman Street.

There isn't enough public infrastructure to allow for the rise of density being planned.

75 This would cripple the existing city and infrastructure

Scenario 3 wipes out the lower Moody Park neighbourhood which contains many heritage homes and mature trees. Take a walk along Nanaimo or Seventh and breathe in the sweet smelling air from the many bushes and trees surrounding you.

Obliterating this mainly single house neighbourhood would also have a direct and negative impact on Kelvin elementary. Currently, this school has lost half its field to portables. Imagine the demands for space with a neighbourhood comprised of townhouses and apartments. The population will go up, not down or neutral.

Street parking is already well used. I can only anticipate negative outcomes with more cars needing street spots.

Finally, infrastructure in this neighbourhood (sewers mainly) is extremely old. New **76** townhouses would need a revamped sewer system.

Our City, Our Homes - Virtual Event General Comments on March 6, 2025

General

- 1 Will the chat be incorporated in your summary and feedback to take forward?
- 2 Will houses with current RS 1 zoning that fall within tier 3 of Sapperton TOD area or any tier 3 of a TOD in New Westminster be included in the Infill Housing and Townhouse Accelerator Initiatives? Will that type of density be allowed in a TOD?
- 3 If not, Why not?
- 4 Looking at opportunities to minimize the intrusive nature of high rise construction -
- 5 I think that's the wrong direction
- 6 Lots needs to be considered when we think about transitions - we need to make
- 7 sure that transitions are occurring properly
- 8 Agree again about the impact of this densification in a city the size of New
- 9 Westminster with its geographic location and limited room for expansion
- 10 Agree on the intrusive nature of high rise development.
- 11 Will transition consideration be given to property owners within the TOD zones
- 12 that will have 8 floor buildings potentially going up beside them.
- 13 What is the overall timeline for the Transit Oriented plan to come out?
- 14 OCP Land Use Designations in place for Infill, Townhouse and TOD by end of the
- 15 year. This allows for rezonings to happen.
- 16 There is a set of DGs coming for those forms
- 17 It is hard to reach Planning staff
- 18 Transit Hubs - where higher density is most appropriate
- 19 How are issues of sustainability being considered?
- 20 We need to start with what we mean by Sustainability. We focus on the "weeds" and "bandaids"
- How is the capacity of New West's small geographical area being considered?
- Especially as we are up on the river?
- Will rezoning still be required? Will public hearings still be required?
- Townhouses / Infill are asking questions about rezoning. Also considering pre-zoning.
- If rezoning is aligned with OCP, public hearings are no longer permitted.
- Looking at infrastructure, operations, waste management
- Working on Design Guidelines for Sustainability. Also through Building Code

Our City, Our Homes - Virtual Event Comments for Infill Housing on March 6, 2025

Infill Housing Comments

- 1 Queensborough - infill housing/suite above the garage. Would like to see opportunities for secondary suites such as lofted garages
Concerned about the inconsistencies across enforcement of legal/illegal secondary suites
Parking challenges with added units
Would like to build a secondary suite for daughter (laneway)
Cannot install a 240-volt charger. Concerned about the traffic considerations getting in and out of Queensborough and expansions to existing infrastructure
Difficulty reaching planning staff
- 2 Queensborough - inconsistent zoning across
What is the rough timeline for changes?
Our provincial extension until 2026 for our approach to Queensborough for Bill 44; we will show our response and potential changes proposed
Considering building a suite/infill for their aging parents and looking to the future
- 3 Q. Scarcity of rentals that accommodate pets - is the City doing anything to restrict how often landlords can restrict pets?
- 4 Q. Friend had a laneway project in Burnaby - in COB, a permit for a laneway costs a lot of \$\$\$, is this true? Would the fees be cheaper in New Westminster?
- 5 Q. Is there a chance the City could make it easier to build laneway houses?

Our City, Our Homes - Virtual Event Comments for Townhouse on March 6, 2025

Townhouse Notes

- 1 see more street parking with 1 off-street parking requirement.
- 2 consider accessibility and walkability for seniors
- 3 more options near parks for pets

Our City, Our Homes - Virtual Event Comments for TOD Areas on March 6, 2025

Transit Oriented Development Area

- 1 Sticky notes are not a good way to collect community feedback, fear that feedback is being lost through this method of collection.
- 2 The City should encourage the higher end of allowable densities in TODAs and not allow lower densities. This would avoid sprawl, provide more funding towards city amenities and make it easier to make mixed use development happen.
- 3 The TODAs are allowing too much density.
- 4 22nd Street Station is the worst station in the Skytrain system and is in dire need of redevelopment.
- 5 Queensborough bridge improvements should happen before densification.
- 6 More mixed use development should be allowed to occur in Queensborough so reduce the need to cross the Queensborough bridge. This decision to not include Queensborough in this update perpetuates the feeling that Queensborough is forgotten.
- 7 Mixed use development needs to be a requirement to support the density proposed by the TODAs.
- 8 Queensborough should not be densified and should be preserved for natural area/wetland to support sustainability. It should have never been developed to begin with.
- 9 The City needs to do more to lobby the Province in supporting all this new density.
- 10 Q. What is the interest from developers on building lower forms of housing?
- 11 Q. What is the cost and timeline of a rezoning application?
- 12 Q. Is the City planning on rezoning in the TODAs?
- 13 Q. How is New Westminster working to create new schools given that they are an important amenity but not funded by the City?
- 14 Q. Has the City seen developer interest in the TODAs?
- 15 Q. Is there any discussion about forming new cities outside of the Metro Vancouver region to accommodate new population growth?
- 16 Q. Is the city planning on allowing zoning changes for RS-1 zoned properties in Tier 3? If not, why not?
- 17 Q. Are RS-1 zoned properties within T3 being considered for the townhouse & infill program? I would like them to be
- 18 Q. Will infill housing be allowed in Tier 3 of TODA?
- 19 Q. What is the federal fund supporting some of the projects presented here today? Is this funding going to homeowners or the city?
- 20 Q. Is there a plan for mitigating the effects of new density in the TODAs?
- 21 Q. How will traffic be mitigated on Twentieth Street near 22nd St Station?
- 22 Q. How will the Queensborough Bridge handle new density around 22nd Street Station?
- 23 Q. Traffic is already a nightmare. How do we consider infrastructure and services with all this growth?

Our City, Our Homes - Survey Comments for Transit Oriented Development Areas

Q6 (OPTIONAL: If you think the proposed extensions should be modified, or you do not support the proposed extensions shown on the maps, please share why.)

Why stop at these modifications? Why does the city limit housing forms outside of the busiest/most congested parts of our city? This is unfair to everyone except for the most entrenched and wealthiest constituents in the City. Additional areas of the City
1 should allow more housing forms as well.

There is already so much development going on and we can't keep up with providing services for those already living in the area. Those blocks should either be left alone or at very most, be designated for townhomes. New Westminster has far too little townhomes
2 and homes for families to live in.

They should be wider. More areas should be denser and Queensborough needs to be
3 part of that.

Townhouses should be allowed everywhere. Single family homes are unaffordable for any family with a normal income. People with kids shouldn't be forced to move to
4 Langley. More density is the future.

Traffic is crazy as it is. You went and put bike lanes in and made traffic worse. Maybe fix the traffic issues first. Then be worried about building 4,6,8 level apartments. Family's need to be able to build on their own property easily and the way they want. We want a
5 coach home. We can't build one because we need our garage. Ridiculous!!!

Some of these areas have strong single family housing that would be devastating for people in them to be rezoned. If there is a middle ground that allows for higher density that limits to things like row housing that would allow neighborhoods to keep the general
6 feeling of family friendly or quiet residential.

7 Extend even further

The TOD areas should be extended even further out than proposed since New West is
8 well served by the skytrain

I do not agree with the proposed extensions on the map if they are going to morph into
9 the 8 story buildings.

10 Stick with the 800 meter range and keep the rest for single family.

I can't visualize the areas by looking at the map. In some places it looks like they are in
11 the middle of a neighbourhood

No more development until our infrastructure catches up. Our population density is the
12 2nd highest in Canada. Let the other, bigger cities catch up.

There are housing areas within the TOD boundary that should be modified in order to preserve some of the historic areas of our city. Once this is changed you can never go back. In some of these areas there are already rental units but only three stories. I also don't understand why all of the townhouses that are being built in the city are in high
13 traffic areas. Years ago there were duplexes built in single family housing areas.

You are increasing density in a City already lacking in ALL amenities! We have insufficient parks, recreation spaces, commerce, shops, parking (Not to mention parking fees...). The new rec centre is already under capacity. Traffic is a nightmare. Not all people will take transit and by your own admission you cannot make developers add parking. Adding 30,000 people to a city lacking in everything will make this place a
14 nightmare.

New Westminster is already the densest city in all of Canada. It is not livable. Stop
15 developing the crap out of it!

Smooth these so remaining infill housing doesn't have to stare at apartment building
16 across the street from them. Smooth it so entire blocks on both sides are covered.

I cannot understand the map. I object to being asked such a global question. The answer likely depends on location,. Also, 8 story apartment buildings are high rises. I don't want
17 to live in an urban jungle.

I don't care where the house and yes I just think that it should go to the people that need it. The most that we need more subsidized housing especially housing for seniors people
18 with disabilities and unhoused people without addiction issues first

19 The area can not handle the traffic. The area is already closed too congested
Where do stop? If there are only 2 lots on the next block, why not extend it there? Stop at
20 the 800 metre. It is a firm line that people will get.

Skytrain cannot actually handle that level of additional capacity, especially as most stations are also planning adjacent housing projects. There will be no room to board cars during peak times. The roads surrounding 22nd StreetStation are already
21 gridlocked during peak hours.

We disagree with Completing the Block principle and all townhouse, preferring a mix of
22 housing types on each block and No hi-rises

The TOD areas from the Province already seem random and conceived without considering the unique characteristics of each area. To expand this area does not seem
23 to resolve any issues or improve anything.

The city is massively overpopulated as is. We need to sort out infrastructure (Roads, Hospitals, Schools, Arenas, Parks, etc) before we look at wringing out the last few inches
24 of space for developers.

25 I don't think it's appropriate for the 22nd street plan.

There are derelict buildings in these areas: owners should be required to make them habitable. The City should oppose further densification of New Westminster until the Province supplies more public transit, especially new rail lines, rather than squeezing more and more people onto just one line. We don't need more construction, more pollution, more crowding. City Council: represent the people of New Westminster,
26 please.

i think the proposed extensions can be further extended to include more parcels between 6th and 8th for a more vibrant uptown and potential densification along existing local bus
27 service between uptown and downtown new west

You are attacking single family homes and the beautiful neighbourhoods and it needs to stop. Family homes are not a commodity they are where you grow up and have a family.
28

29 You guys are wrecking this city just to pay for your bad spending habits

30 More dense areas should be extended beyond, and provide appropriate public transport

In general I support the extensions but I believe the extensions should focus on encouraging Townhome forms rather than allowing 8 storey apartments. I also think that the city should petition the Province to allow for more flexibility in defining the TOA so that properties can be "traded" from one TOA to another or that the TOA shape could be

31 modified while still keeping the overall intent of the legislation.

New Westminster is congested as it is. Why is it we have to add more people to an already uncomfortably full municipality? This is a big province- country. We don't need to add a more people here, develop more out in the Fraser valley or grow some smaller towns in the interior. It's hard to get around here as it is. The quality of life has been affected by jamming too many people here now, and you want to make it worse?? I've been living in New West for about 33 years, and I'm now starting to hate it here because of overcrowding, poor choices in street design (6 th street) and trying to maximize tax base by jamming as many hi- rises in an area as possible. We've reached our comfort limit, don't make it any worse , you'll just make people more unhappy that they already

32 are living here, and not everyone can afford to move.

The entire planning approach is flawed in the extreme. TOD densification must be considered on a case-by-case basis in relation to market demand for housing of various types. New Westminster is unique. Residential areas can change dramatically on a block-by-block basis. Specific homes on specific streets might be tremendously different than all the other houses. NO cookie cutter is suitable. The blanket upzoning of BC should be rejected entirely. Push back. The policy is likely to be repealed or drastically amended.

33 Pause this process for two years, minimum.

Differences within a block are charming, and are seen in cities with character. "Complete the block" sounds like an AI solution suitable for cities with sheeple. Example: the cemeteries are included in the high-density-must build-no excuses zone, so will they be

34 decommissioned for highrises, too? Baaa!

35 More affordable townhomes and duplex/triplex/fourplexes; fewer high rise towers.

Don't agree with the properites along 8th between Sherbrooke and Richmond. Would be better to not include the corner block at Sherbrooke and Richmond and leave the whole

36 triangle as it is.

It appears that you are suggesting that 8 story apartment buildings may be built within established single family home areas such as Queens Ave area and surrounding Queens park streets. This would negatively impact the entire area and lose forever the historic

37 community feel and neighborhood that has been developed over many, many years.

It makes no sense to propose that single family homes in tier 3 areas could be rezoned for 8 story apartment buildings. You do not offer an option of ONLY townhouses and infill

38 housing which would be more acceptable.

New Westminster is staying blissfully ignorant of the thousands of Burnaby citizens who are now starting to live in some of the proposed 27 towers being built on the north side of 10th avenue. How do you think all these people will move in and out of this area with the

39 already over crowded streets and walkways?.

40 I propose only townhouses in the blue zones

The reach to too great. The TODA has no environmental sensitivity. This creates a

41 trajectory toward a silent city, with no wildlife, and no soul.

I actually support the proposed extensions with the exception of the Queens Park residential area which is a protected Heritage Conservation area. This survey question is

42 a broad brush, one response for all areas.

I do not feel that extending the boundaries will contribute positively to accessing rapid transit by people limited by mobility. The city must consider that mobility and accessibility will limit people's access to Skytrains and extending the Transit Area boundary gives a

43 false radius of the distance ALL people can travel to access rapid transit.

Packing people up and ruin New West identity and character doesn't make the market more affordable, it's mere speculation. Roads cannot afford more traffic, high

44 densification without family doctors, schools, roads is totally unacceptable!

Wanna know, how much?! Build whatever you want, just stop only making it affordable

45 for rich fat fingered men. Just stop. It's embarrassing.

There will already be enough densification in the existing area, the City doesn't have resources, infrastructure, space for essential services as is, why add even more area to

46 struggle accomodating?

47 Apply the townhouse and infill designations to the whole city as standard.

Ensure that the height between buildings flows naturally and it has been studied for the

48 proposed new extensions. Make sure that this 8 storey isn't by a single family house

The city thrived with mix neighbourhoods of apartments, single family home with churches and stores walkable. We have 20 unit apartments on 66X132 lots. Now we should be looking at the model plus adding townhouse and row homes which targets the

49 middle that can afford a condo but not a house.

In the first 2 maps shown I feel like there already should be more 6-8 story condos. But also be sure to put amenity such as rec spaces for people. I say rec spaces because it people need places for exercise and celebration when there is no park space on a nice day. I as a parent am driving 30min in the city to find this sort of space. Now for areas in the 3rd shown map. It's quite sleepy there still and i don't see condos there. Unless 22nd station/connaught heights gets developed. It would benefit so many people . There is so much potential to even add a secondary school, grocery store, rec center with pool, medical needs. It could help so many New Westminster/Burnaby residents that are not

50 even in the Connaught heights area. There is so much walkable potential there.

I selected Support but would like to add that I do not live in a TOD and so would not be

51 directly affected by any changes

New West is already too dense. With all the building over the last 20 years, we haven't

52 solved any housing crisis, prices have only gone up. We need more amenities FIRST!!!

53 I don't think the TOD should extend past 20th street.

54 too much unrequired inclusion for the 22nd street area

We have home owners in these areas that would get choked out. They have a right to live where they want to live. This is a totalitarian plan that a vocal minority is forcing down our throats. I think your surveys have been infiltrated by these activists and your surveys

55 are lying to the public.

the property on 323 Governors Court which runs from East Columbia Street and Cumberland to Miner should be included in entirety (in the TODA) and not just a portion
56 of. It is a large piece of land that has potential for significant development

These boundaries are too wide spread, if this continues there will be absolutely very little residential neighborhoods as known today. Does this make our community more livable
57, not likely.

58 develop process that 'newer' sf can increase density without existing housing removal

59 Too disruptive to neighborhoods

Simply adding density around sky train stations when those stations in New West are also on the main through roads to the hwy and bridges seems to ignore the fact that MOST traffic in New West travels through New West. Adding density to areas that are already pinch points in traffic sounds like it is creating a nightmare for residence. It's not just roads that are maxed out at certain times of the day, skytrain too is maxed out. Creating density around these stations without forcing the province to increase services of skytrain specifically puts all the responsibility of solving this issue on residence, and not back on the province.

I would like to know how the city is planning to address the traffic pinch points in New West that already sees grid lock every Monday-Friday. Why are they not pushing back against the province on this requirement to increase density when New West doesn't have many places to expand and is already the second densest in the country, which makes us the most dense in BC. Adding density along skytrain routes, while in theory makes sense, however not everyone in those buildings will be taking skytrain, there will be vehicles as well, and density in these locations will make an already bad situation worse and impact the quality of life for residence who have to deal with the commuters
60 traveling our neighbourhoods.

I appreciate the consideration of completing a block so that home owners' property
61 values are not impacted by being located directly beside an apartment building.

Extension make sense if you're including a couple of lots at the end of the block.

62 If it's half way through the block might not make sense.

Areas next to Sapperton and Brain do not have adequate road facilities and have backed
63 up traffic frequently. Increasing density there will cause further issues.

Twelfth St block from 3rd Ave to 5th Ave should also be included. This area has multiple MURBs and some houses a handful of houses or empty lots. It makes no sense to keep this area of a few houses and surrounded by apartment buildings. This area is becoming run down and takes away from the walkability of Twelfth St. If this street was more developed with multi-use buildings and retailers or would drive more leisure foot traffic towards the boardwalk. Right now many people drive to the boardwalk because there are a few blocks of nothing to see and do until they go past the rail tracks overpass by

64 Steel & Oak.

I support them if they are done sympathetically. High rises up to the boundary would not
65 be considered sympathetic.